

## Chapter Six

### German Unification

#### Outline and Study Guide:

1. Various Interpretations
2. Factors unfavorable and favorable to German unification
3. German Revolution From 1815 to 1848
4. German Revolution From 1848 to 1871
5. **Explain the initial success and ultimate failure of the revolts which broke out in 1848 German Confederation.**
6. **Discuss the causes and significance of the 1848 German Revolution.**
7. To what extent were the revolutions in Germany between 1848 and 1850 motivated by liberalism and nationalism?
8. Discuss the significance of the 1848 Revolutions in Germany and the Hapsburg Empire.
9. **Give an account of the obstacles to German unification and explain how these unfavorable elements were removed in the course of German unification movement.**
10. Discuss the role of Bismarck in the unification of Germany by 1871.
11. What were the aims and means of Bismarck's foreign policy between 1862 and 1871? How did he contribute to the unification of Germany by 1871?
12. Give an account of the stages by which Bismarck brought Germany under the Prussian crown.
13. Discuss the role of economic development of Prussia in the German Unification by 1871.
14. **Trace the formation of Zollverein and discuss its contribution to German unification.**
15. Evaluate the importance of the Zollverein in the movement for German unification
16. Discuss the Schleswig-Holstein Question and its role on the German Unification by 1871.
17. Account for the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War and discuss its significance.
18. **“Nationalism and liberalism went hand in hand.” Discuss the validity of this statement with reference to the Italian and German unification movement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.**
19. “Nationalism and liberalism went hand in hand.” Discuss the validity of this statement with reference to the German unification movement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.
20. Evaluate the importance of nationalism and Bismarck's strategy in the German Unification.
21. **“Germany was unified by calculation rather than improvisation” Discuss this statement.**
22. Cavour and Bismarck in the 19<sup>th</sup> century European history.
23. **Compare and contrast the Italian and German unification in terms of leadership, obstacles and reasons of success.**
24. In what ways was 1870 the turning point in European history?
25. To what extent did the German Unification under the leadership of Prussia mark the end of the Concert of Europe?

26. Identify and account for the similarities and differences between foreign policies adopted by Cavour and Bismarck in the course of the respective country's unification.
27. Compare the role of Bismarck in the unification of Germany with that of Cavour in the unification of Italy.
28. Analyze the relationship between liberalism and the German unification movement.

## **Various Interpretations**

J.M. Keynes:

1. "The German Empire was built more truly on "Coal and Iron" than 'blood and iron'."

Bowring(1840)

1. "The general feeling in Germany towards the Zollverein is that it is the first step towards what is called the Germanization of the people. By the community of interests on commercial and trading questions it had broken down some of the strongest holds of alienation and hostility and it has paved the way for a political nationality- it has subdued much local feeling and habit and replaced them by a wider and stronger element of German nationality."

Lipson:

1. "Economic unity paved the way for political unity, and community of material interests stimulated the growth of national feeling and fostered national consciousness."

W. Carr:

1. "Annexation of Schleswig-Holstein was in Bismarck's mind from the very beginning."

Otto Becker

1. "a German patriot whose primary aim from the outset was national unification."

A.J.P. Taylor

1. "War was a national industry of Prussia."
2. "In 1848 German history reached its turning point and failed to turn..... the success of the revolution discredited conservative ideas; the failure of the revolution discredited liberal ideas. After it nothing remained but the idea of Force, and the idea stood at the helm of German history from then on."
3. "Germany was not unified but Prussianized."
4. "Bismarck's greatness lay not in mastering events, but in going with events so as to seem to master them. He had no rigidly defined program when he became Prime Minister in 1862, beyond preserving the Junker social order."
5. "The Treaty of Gastein...has been a subject of endless controversy. Some have seen in it simply a calculated step by Bismarck on the path towards an inevitable war, others found in it the proof of his desire to re-establish the conservative

German partnership of Metternich's day. May be it was neither.... His diplomacy in this period seems rather calculated to frighten Austria than to prepare for war. The only bait he held out to France was that, if Prussia got the Duchies, she would apply the national principle by restoring northern Schleswig to Denmark; all he asked in return was benevolent neutrality."

Namier

1. "with 1848 starts the German bid for power, for European predominance, for world dominion."

Hazen:

1. "The Parliament of Frankfurt, on which such hopes had been centered, failed in the end, to some extent because of the mistakes of its members, but chiefly because of the resolute opposition of the princes of Germany, and in particular, of Prussia and Austria, the two leading German states, neither of which was willing to make any sacrifices for the common good and each of which was jealous and suspicious of the other."

David Thomson:

1. "To him, it is rare in history for even the greatest of statesmen to plan successfully 10 years ahead and then to impose their plans on the world. The recent biographers are very skeptic about the truth of what Disraeli is said to have reported. It is contended that Bismarck was not like Metternich or Alexander I, a system-maker. He was a brilliant opportunist whose course of action always remained undecided and flexible until the last moment, and his policy looks more clear-cut and coherent in retrospect than it was at the time. He was first and always a Prussian nationalist who believed that Prussian interests demanded that she should dominate the whole of Germany and exclude Austria from German affairs. His policy towards Denmark, Austria and France was guided by the interests of Prussia and unification of Germany was incidental and a by-product of his never-ending pursuit of Prussian interests."
2. "Cavour was also a brilliant and ingenious opportunist rather than the framer of long-term plans for a distant future. Neither he, nor Bismarck, believed in future. Both of them were always engrossed with the present. They were supreme practitioners of realpolitik and their success is to be explained more by the profound and imaginative grasp of the immediate realities of international politics than by any alleged control over the long-term course of events. They were masterly statesmen and not masterful supermen."
3. "Both of them had a minimum program to which they devoted all their energies to achieve. A united kingdom of northern Italy and a Prussian-controlled North German Federation seemed practical programs of policy during the 1850's. Both of them were within the grasp of practical politics if Austria could be driven back, behind Alps and Main, and if the great powers did not intervene on the side of Austria. Once the sequence of diplomatic movements and military events had started, the events themselves began to take control. The statesmen of Italy and Germany adjusted their policies to take account of each new situation and exploited them to achieve their own ends."

## Factors Favorable and Unfavorable to German Unification

### Germany in 1815:

The German Confederation as created in 1815 was only negative organization with the object of keeping the smaller states out of the way while Austria and Prussia more easily and effectively checked France. The idea that a reduced or simplified number of states would be the first step towards unification was never contemplated. Such was seen in the constitution of the Confederation. Each of the German states had complete sovereignty and the Diet had no power to enforce its resolutions and be able to act as an executive organization. The German Confederation of 1815 thus in no sense a “national association” as its name would imply.

#### I. Factors unfavorable to German Unification:

The rise of a leader, the discovery of the right method, the ousting of Austria, the exclusion of foreign rulers, the wielding of the North and the South in one of all presented difficulties.

##### 1. The arrangement of Vienna Congress:

Germany was created not a nation but a Confederation of 39 states only. These states had complete sovereignty. They were autonomous and virtually independent, able to conduct even its own foreign policy. The Constitution was so worded that it aimed at preventing changes. The declared object was not to promote German unity but rather “the maintenance of the exterior and interior security of Germany, the independence and inviolability of the member States.” No change for unity was therefore permitted. The Diet was ineffective to give real German unity. Rivalry between Austria and Prussia, the calumny among the States and that division between Northern Germany, Protestant, militant and pro-Prussian and South Germany, Catholic and pro-Austria, all made it difficult to pass resolutions by two-third majority. Then resolutions passed might be disobeyed since the Diet had no force or means like an army to reform them. The States could choose to ignore and disobey. Leadership of the Confederation was given to Austria for her traditional role as Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. This worked against unification since Austria, by reason of her racial composition, could not be a leader to strengthen German unity. Therefore, she was against nationalism and would not allow anyone to take the lead of German unification. It also enabled Metternich to apply his reactionary politics to Germany. The sharp cleavage between the North German States and Southern German States were obstacles (unless overcome by a strong sense of nationalism and national bond). Religion, culture, inclination and outlook separated the two parts, resulting in only mutual jealousy, hatred and fear. As they followed Austria and looked to France they were never easy to be brought together with North Germany or be persuaded to form into one solid nation-meaning unity. The arrangement left foreign rulers as German princes. The king of Denmark ruled the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. If unification was to be achieved their hold must be abandoned.

##### 2. The Metternich System:

- i. After 1815, events of Germany were dominated by Metternich. He played on the fear of the princes for their own security to get them to support Austrian

designs of suppressing liberty and nationalism. Incidents of unrest were exaggerated to serve Metternich's purpose. Later the Carlsbad Decrees 1819 were passed. "A grand example of vigor," he wrote, "has just been given German."

- ii. Even Frederick William who was willing to grant liberal concessions was prevented by the great influence of Metternich on him. Revolutions outside Germany like that in Naples, Sardinia, Spain were crushed by decisions of the Congress System. This warned Germans who cherished dreams of nationalism and liberalism. Therefore, the day of unified Germany was far and remote.

### **3. Internal Disunity:**

Divided views with regard to the means for attaining unification were an obstacle and the belief that it could be unified by "speeches and majority votes" was a mistake as proved by events of 1848-49. The schemes of Frederick William IV, to organize a League of Princes had caused the failure of the efforts of the Frankfurt Parliament. He could afford to refuse the crown "out of the gutter" when he had a better scheme of his own.

### **4. Russian intervention:**

The Russian alliance with Austria in latter years after 1848 was a strong hindrance. This was seen in the Austrian threat causing Frederick William IV to refuse the crown of the Frankfurt Parliament and to abandon the League of Princes at Olmutz.

## **II. Favorable factors to German Unification:**

### **1. The arrangement of the Vienna Congress was significant:**

- i. Prussia lost Polish to Prussia but acquired the Rhine Provinces as compensation. She thus became more Germanic by the loss of 3 million Poles and a corresponding gain of 3 million Germans. Her Germanic interest became more marked and this pointed to a Prussian leadership to unify Germany rather than Austria, for the latter had more non-Germans within her Empire. Leadership was a first essential for German unification.
- ii. Prussia by acquisition of German lands compared favorably with Austria which got only Italian land (Lombardy, Venetia and the duchies). The balance of power in Germany was now shifted in Prussian favor, allowing the use of a stronger Prussia in Germany to lead in unification.
- iii. By the addition of 2/5 Saxony and the Rhine Provinces, Prussia was also considerably strengthened to benefit for her leadership. Also by the acquisition of the Rhine Provinces, Prussia came to be so placed that on her shoulder was now imposed the national task of defending the Rhine against French aggression. Whether she was willing, Prussia now posed more than Austria as the defender of Germany.
- iv. The idea that a reduced or simplified number of states would be the first step towards unification was never thought of. But the step was momentous. To reduce the number of states from 300 more to only 39, the way was eased for success of unification.

### **2. Nationalistic agitation:**

The agitation of German nationalists was kept alive by the 'liberal' politics of some southern states like Wurtemberg where the tradition of alliance with France kept liberalism very much alive (though the princes deemed it is expedient to grant charters and to retain Napoleonic codes of laws but in many a case, restrictions on the press and arbitrary police activity was kept up). The songs and poems of Ernst Arndt also helped to fire national enthusiasm.

### 3. Metternich's suppression:

Suppressed by Metternich's Carlsbad Decrees in 1819 the nationalist cause did not die. Disappointed German nationalists only became more restless. The need was felt even more keenly.

### 4. Formation of Zollverein: (use suitable interpretation to reinforce your argument here)

- i. The formation of the Zollverein (or customs union) under Prussia fostered Prussian leadership. 'It first made Prussia essential to Germany.' The first intent of the Zollverein was something very different. On the European continent, all the unified countries had healthy and strong domestic markets, adopting a trade policy with protective tariffs. The Prussian territories of 1815 were scattered across northern Germany. Prussia was a collection of separate provinces each with its distinct scale of tariffs and prohibitions. Prussia could not wait for the general German tariff which had been promised in the Federal Diet. Prussia's two chief exports were corn and linen and both were directly affected by British policy of increasingly finding European markets. She turned to the task of freeing the German home market from internal obstructions, partly in order to ensure easier sale for these goods.
- ii. In 1818, the **Tariff Reforms Laws** was passed. By that Act, all raw materials were to be imported free. A duty of 10 percent was to be levied on manufactured goods and 20 percent on colonial goods. All internal custom duties were abolished. Heavy transit duties on tariff goods passing through Prussia were imposed with a view to compel other States to join Prussia. The result of the reform of 1818 was that Prussia became a free trade area. Internal trade increased and the revenue of the States also showed a rise.
- iii. The law of 1818 applied to Prussia alone, but in course of time **many other German States joined** her. In 1819, Schwarzburg-Sondershausen joined the Union. In 1822, Weimar, Gotha, Mercklenburg-Schwerin, Schaumburg-Lippe, Rudolstadt and Hamburg also joined.
- iv. However, there was **opposition to the Custom Union** from other German States. In 1828, a Custom Union was set up in the South under the leadership of Bavaria and Wurtemberg. In the same year, another Custom Union of the middle States was formed also. It consisted of Saxony, Hesse-Cassel, Hanover, Brunswick and the free cities of Hamburg, Bremen and Frankfurt.
- v. However, in 1831, Hesse-Cassel joined the Zollverein and the union of the middle States was broken up. In 1834, Bavaria joined the Zollverein for 8 years. The terms of the Union were that the meetings were to be held at Berlin and other places. Bavarian goods were to be given special treatment. In the same year, Saxony also joined. Finally, an enlarged Zollverein was formed in 1834, joined by 18 German states. By 1837, most of the States had joined the Zollverein. The maintenance of the Zollverein was based on the renewal of

treaties among the member states. **Whenever the treaties expired they were renewed.** Only Hanover, Oldenburg, Mecklenburg and the Hanse towns remained outside the Zollverein. The main terms of entry into the Zollverein were complete free trade between State and State, uniform tariff on all frontiers and net proceeds to be divided in proportion to population of the States concerned.

- vi. To begin with, Austria was completely indifferent to the Zollverein. Metternich did not attach any importance to commerce and consequently ignored the activities of the Zollverein. However, after the overthrow of Metternich in 1848, Austria made a determined effort to join the Zollverein. Prussia resisted the same and was successful. **In 1853, a treaty was entered** into between the Zollverein and Austria by which certain concessions were given mutually.
- vii. The Zollverein was almost the only serious event in the 'quiet years'. In a short run and also in some aspects it was not a step towards the unification of Germany, but **a device for making the unification of Germany less necessary**; it was the price which the German princes, including the King of Prussia, paid for continuing to exist. **Moreover, it was an achievement of the princes, not of the peoples.** The concessions which it involved were violently opposed in the Chambers of the lesser states; and if Prussia, who made the greatest financial concessions, had possessed a parliament, the Zollverein would never have been established. The Zollverein became, in time, a powerful instrument in Prussia's control of Germany. But the Prussian statesmen who made the Zollverein had not the slightest idea of its political consequences; they saw only the rambling, unworkable frontiers and desired to save money on their customs officers.
- viii. The importance of Zollverein cannot be however minimized. As Marriot and Robertson pointed out, "For the first time Germany became a fiscal and commercial unit." The Zollverein united the German states in bonds of mutual economic interests. It united them under the leadership of Prussia; and it accustomed them to the exclusion of Austria from the Germanic body. More important of all is that the semblance of political union was carefully avoided, but the germs of political union were nevertheless present in the growing community of material interests. As Browning stated, "the general feeling in Germany towards the Zollverein is that it is the first step towards what is called the Germanization of the people. By the community of interests on commercial and trading questions it had broken down some of the strongest holds of alienation and hostility and it has paved the way for a political nationality- it has subdued much local feeling and habit and replaced them by a wider and stronger element of German nationality." Again, patient, sagacious and even liberal in its negotiations with its weak neighbors, Prussia silently connected with itself through the ties of financial union States which had hitherto looked to Austria as their natural head. The reputation of the Prussian Government no less than the welfare of the Prussian people was advanced by each successive step in the extension of the Zollverein.
- ix. The Zollverein was **in large part the result of Prussian determination.** Its aim, so far it expressed a deliberate policy, was to prevent economic union through the German Confederation, a protectionist union which would have been dominated by Austria and would have found its center of gravity in the Danube valley to the political and economic ruin of Prussia. The Prussian

Zollverein, in contrast, looked across the North Sea to the world market. Based upon the low Prussian tariff, it promoted German prosperity not by excluding foreign goods but by making trade between Germany and foreign countries easier. It was in origin essentially a consumer's scheme, catering for German industrial development only by accident. **It should be pointed out that the Zollverein, despite its anti-national origin, could not be maintained without an increasing appeal to national sentiment; and that sentiment moved in terms of conflict, not in terms of prosperity.** Within a decade of the founding of the Zollverein, the great publicist, List, was arguing that the purpose of unity in economic, as in other, matters was to make Germany stronger for war - stronger for economic war, stronger ultimately for war pure and simple. The sensible Free Trade bureaucrats of Prussia who designed the Zollverein and at first controlled its workings against List's doctrine, but in the long run they lost and List won. As List's idea was turned into official policy from 1830s to 1840s, the period was also termed as "The Era of List". The Zollverein, instead of promoting the exchange of goods between Prussia and the outer world, would **ultimately prepare the way for a unified and exclusive central Europe**; and instead of drawing German trade down the Elbe and Rhine to the North Sea it would end by committing Prussia's military resources to the support of the Berlin to Bagdad railway.

- x. The impact of the Zollverein was simply impressive. By 1860, the industrial production of the German states had substantially surpassed that of France, sharing a 16% of the global industrial production value.

### 5. Unexpected fruit after the 1830 revolution

In 1830, revolution broke out in Paris and Charles X lost his throne. There was a great fear that the story of the French Revolution might repeat itself, Metternich persuaded the German states to take precautionary measure and to revive the Carlsbad Decrees. The federal army was not organized. Only the Prussian army was on the alert, garrisoning on the Rhine. Thus in this crisis, Prussia had unwillingly become the defender of Germany. She was more confirmed in her association with the German nationalists.

### 6. Accession of Frederick William IV(1840-61).

During the long reign of Frederick William III, much could not be expected from Prussia. However, he was succeeded by William IV in 1840 and something changed. The union of Junker Prussia and national Germany, this wedding of opposites, was accomplished by him. He tried to meet the liberal desires of the Prussians. He also released a number of political prisoners. The provincial estates were allowed to meet regularly and discuss their affairs freely. The freedom of press was restored although liberal constitution never granted. He did dream of some resurrection of the old Reich, in which the Emperor should have the nominal superiority, but he King of Prussia the real power. The direction of unification was determined.

### 7. Ideological development

- i. According to H. Kinder, there were about 4 ideological trends: While South German liberalism advocated pacific and nationalistic conceptions joined with the demands for self-determination, trial by jury, a popular militia and a na-



tional system of economics; the North German liberalism developed more slowly, modeled after the English example, and pre-eminently stressed national union pleading for Prussian leadership in Germany. While Conservatism founded its strongest support in the circle around the Prussian crown prince; the political socialism was influenced by Romanticism and its influence was very limited in an agrarian society.

- ii. The writing of scholars and philosophers added another impetus, especially the philosophy of Hegel. He first made the advance of Prussia into the national limelight inevitable when he argued that “true freedoms to be found in working in line with the trend of history” and showed that Prussia was actually the culmination of historical process. “Honor, Freedom and Fatherland” was the motto of the student movement at the time which was deeply influenced by his ideas. He advised that submission to the Prussian state should be the choice of every free man. His ideas did spread and Prussia was looked at in a new light by Prussians and other Germans alike.

### **8. “Coal and Iron”**

The industrial growth was great help. The work of unification was as much due to coal and iron as to ‘blood and iron’. The production of coal, iron and steel increased rapidly and this facilitated improved transport of such vital importance to military movements of troops. Railways gave solidity and most important of all unity. The 1850 Constitution granted limited franchise to the promised middle class and this enabled tremendous industrial progress which laid the foundation of her industrial power.

## German Revolution from 1815 to 1848

### A. 1830 Revolutions

1. Influenced by the July Revolution of France, agitation and revolution broke out. The rulers of Saxony, Brunswick and Hesse-Cassel were forced to abdicate and constitutions were introduced. Later, a constitution was also granted to Hanover.
2. Berlin and Vienna were not affected. Soon the revolution were suppressed and reaction was restored.
3. After the 1830 revolution the basic political structure remained unchanged but the psychological effects were profound. Liberalism which demanded for the outing of autocratic rule revived and developed quickly. Most radicals regarded nationalism as an anarchistic and retrograde force.
4. After the 1830 revolution, the Zollverein was set up. It became the first step in the German unification and industrialization.

### B. 1848 revolutions

#### I. Background:

1. After the failure of the 1830 Revolution there was a revival of liberal and national movement, which inevitably came into direct conflicts with the repressive measures. National liberalism was the dominant political posture of the 1840s, demanding for liberal constitution and for unification.
2. In 1847 the Prussian king allowed 8 provincial states to meet as a united estate. Though the liberals failed to attain their objectives, the sharp conflicts between the crown and the estate helped weaken the basis of Prussian absolutism.
3. During the Civil War in Swiss in the late 1847, German liberals demanded the immediate summoning of a German national parliament. Unrest of 2 German states brought unbelievable harm to the prestige of monarchy in South Germany.
4. Social and Economic changes also responsible for the revolution.
  - i. In the 1840s, there were rapid social changes. Industrial revolution, though still at its very beginning, led to the rise of the proletariat. Urban discontent centered round the handworkers. The status of craftsmen declined. Unemployment and poverty led to discontent and disturbance.
  - ii. There was much discontent in the countryside at the end of the 1840s. The economic crises in the 1840s suffered many peasants. Rapid growth of population also led to the increase in landless laborers and a general decline in living standard. Such social and economic unrest, on the one hand, stimulated the liberal demands for reforms and on the other hand, provided a favorable background to revolution.
5. The downfall of the illiberal citizen king- Louis Phillip, also deeply excited and encouraged the Germans to demand for representative government and for the creation of a united Germany. The resignation and flight of Metternich also signified the end of reactionary Metternich system.

## II. Course: Initial Success

1. Shortly after the 1848 Revolution in France, the Germans excited. From 15<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> March there were riots in Berlin. Frederick William IV was forced to declare his willingness to 'merge Prussia into Germany' and agreed to summon a Constituent Assembly. Freedom of speech and press, and one nation citizenship were promised. Smaller German states also made concessions to the revolutions.
2. Towards the end of March, about 5,000 leaders determined to establish democracy and equality in Germany. They met at Frankfurt and formed themselves a provisional government and called for a national assembly.
3. They were going to draw up constitution for a united Germany. This national assembly was generally known as the Frankfurt Parliament. It was mainly a middle class body which particularly concerned with the preparation of the federation of the German lands.
4. In March 1849, a constitution was adopted and King Frederick William IV was elected as the Emperor.

## II. Course: Ultimate Failure

1. At the end of April, the King refused to accept the offer because of :
  - i. he was completely out of sympathy with the Revolution;
  - ii. He was deeply suspicious of Little Germany;
  - iii. Franco-German relation was deteriorating;
  - iv. Austria was hostile to Little Germany and behind Austria stood the Tzar. Acceptance of the crown would lead to war with them.
  - v. The crown was offered by the revolutionaries which violated the 'divine right of kings'.
2. Then the majority of the members of the Parliament withdrew. The members were also dispersed by the Prussian soldiers.
3. On December 5, 1848 the king dissolved the Assembly and promulgated a restricted constitution which maintained royal authority.

## III. Reasons of failure:

1. The liberals believed they could achieve their aims by converting their rulers. The Radicals demanded a People's Republic. However both had no connection with the people of Germany. Both failed to solve the discontent of the non-propertied, uneducated restless masses.
2. The members of the Frankfurt Assembly were too idealistic with no experience of national politics. They discussed too much and had no armed forces. They refused to go with the masses and failed to offer a social program.
3. The revolutionaries in Austria and Prussia were suppressed. With the support of Austria, Prussia sent troops to disperse the assembly members.
4. Germany was a predominantly rural community. 64% of the population lived in the rural areas. Since the revolution had no agrarian program, its failure was inevitable. Industrialization was at its very beginning also. There was no sufficient number of proletariat to stage a proletariat revolution as prophesied by Marx.

#### IV. Significance of the 1848 revolution (significance of the failure of the Frankfurt Assembly)

A.J. Taylor correctly pointed out that “in 1848 German history reached its turning point and failed to turn..... the success of the revolution discredited conservative ideas; the failure of the revolution discredited liberal ideas. After it nothing remained but the idea of Force, and the idea stood at the helm of German history from then on.”

1. Liberalism was discredited. As Bismarck later said, speech and debate were no longer suitable for unification. In 1848 the whole of the middle class was politically and economically conscious. However, the failure of the revolution was a great shock to them. Being politically disappointed, some migrated to the USA every year in the 1850s which weakened the democratic movement in Germany. A number of Germans also turned their attention to economic endeavors. Many liberals also withdrew to academic studies or served Germany by applying science to practical needs. Some turned from politics to industry and finance. The liberal politicians were more moderate and practical than ever before. All the talent of Germany sought a substitute in industry for the political power. It had two prominent effects: on the one hand, it speeded up the industrialization process, on the other, it gave nationalism as the top priority in unification. National liberalism became a more precisely defined concept with a colder and more realistic spirit. Both also helped the completion of Unification by the 1870s.
2. After 1850 there began in Germany a period of industrial development, after 1871 even an industrial revolution. The Zollverein became a means of Prussianization and facilitated the unification. Economic power passed within a generation into the hands of industrial capitalists. The German capitalists became dependents of Prussian militarism and accepted dictatorship. As Taylor said, it was the legacy of the 1848 revolution.
3. Though Marx and Engels played a very minor role in the revolution, the *Communist Manifesto* was influential. In August 1848, the first Worker's Congress in Berlin was held. It was the first attempt of the industrial proletariat to organize itself politically. W. Carr also pointed out that after the revolution there was an alliance between landed and industrial wealth, which underpinned the social order in William IV's Germany. After 1870, Bismarck even carried out state socialism to prevent proletariat revolution.
4. The failure of the 1848 revolution also had great impacts on political development. Prussia stood in 1848 as champion of the national cause. Though concessions were later withdrawn, the King kept his promise. A constitution was granted in 1850 which authorized a legislature of two houses, the upper house to be aristocratic and the lower to be peculiarly elected, though on inequitable basis. This was a step ahead of the other German states and won support for Prussia from German liberals. The constitution also served as the model of the constitutions of 1867 and 1871.

5. According to Namier, “with 1848 starts the German bid for power, for European predominance, for world dominion.”
  - i. Similar to the Italians the Germans learnt a bitter lesson from failure. The failure of the Revolution proved that ‘the great question of the day’ would be settled by ‘blood and iron’ only. Since 1848, the Germans adopted real politick, such as giving precedence to foreign policy, including the use of war as the ultima ratio of politics. Internal reforms and skillful diplomacy were also used. The methods had been founded.
  - ii. The seeds of totalitarianism was simultaneously sown. It explains why the democratic Weimar Republic for only 14 years and why Nazism was accepted by the Germans.
6. In the Frankfurt Assembly, there were two proposals for the unified Germany, namely Greater Germany and Little Germany. As stated by A.J. Taylor, these two proposals had deep impact on the course of German history.
  - i. Little Germany became the target of unification and therefore there was war against Austria in 1866 in the road to unification. Prussia was offered the crown of a united Germany by the Frankfurt Parliament. Indeed, the impossibility of including Austria was once more proved. And if Frederick William refused the crown upon the threat of Austria, the latter was to be seen further dissociated with the nationalist cause. Frederick had declined the offer, but his League of Princes was meant to be an improvement of the old German Confederation under Austria and for her, Prussia had for the first time openly challenged Austria. She had taken the first effort to unify Germany.
  - ii. From 1870 to 90, Bismarck carried out a series of policies to prevent the achievement of a Greater Germany such as colonial expansion and the building into the Balkans. He also devised the alliance system to restrain Austrian expansion into the Balkans. Nonetheless, the downfall of Bismarck and the rule of William II adopted “World Politics” and encouraged Pan-Germanism. It finally led to the outbreak of the WWI. This concept was also revived when Hitler incorporated Austria in 1938 and invaded Poland in 1939, which led to the WWII.

## German Revolution from 1848 to 1871

### Important Figures: William I, King of Prussia (1861-1888):

When Frederick William IV became insane in 1857, his younger brother Prince William became regent. When the king died in 1861, William I succeeded to the throne.

#### I. His character:

1. William I possessed qualities which endeared him to the governing classes of Prussia. He was industrious and honest, deeply religious, rigidly conservative, and fully convinced of the divine right of kingship. He also believed in the national mission of Prussia to unify Germany. Nationalists and even liberals welcomed his accession.
2. The situation that confronted him in Prussia and in the German Bund had been greatly transformed by the activities of Napoleon and Cavour, and especially by their war of 1859 against Austria and their erection of a new Italian kingdom. The significant decision in Prussian policy had been her refusal to assert Prussia's role as an independent great power, to stay in reserve as a possible mediator of the dispute.

#### II. His ideas:

1. William was a soldier. He had a devout belief in the army as the finest expression of the Prussian spirit. He began a reform of the Prussian army. He appointed von Moltke as Chief of Staff of the Army and von Roon as Minister of War. Both were anti-liberal.
2. William believed in a strong Prussian monarchy. He believed that only through Prussia could Germany be united and only through a strong army could he hope to attain this objective. He proposed to increase compulsory military service to prepare and strengthen the Prussian army by increasing its numbers from 500,000 to 750,000. For this purpose he demanded from the Prussian parliament an increase of taxation.
3. However, the lower house of the Prussian parliament was less eager for military reform. This body was responsive to the liberal sentiment which was resurgent among the middle classes of Prussia. The liberal leaders were anxious to make Prussia a constitutional monarchy with responsible parliamentary government, and to prevent a military monopoly of the Junkers. They proposed certain amendments to the military laws. The elections of 1862 gave liberal opposition a large majority in the lower house of the Prussian parliament. In order to express their opposite view of army reform, they refused to pass the budget.
4. William I believed that he was faced not merely with a constitutional, but with a real political crisis. To surrender meant the end of the Prussian monarchy as he understood it, and the King of Prussia would then be controlled by the representatives of the Prussian people. He could see no way out but abdication. But von Roon persuaded the king to call in Bismarck as chief minister and foreign minister, with the special task of defying the liberals and the lower house. At his first

meeting with the budget committee Bismarck issued his most famous warning: ‘the great questions of the day will not be decided by speeches and the resolutions of majorities - that was the blunder of 1848 and 1849 - but by blood and iron.’

### **Important Figures: Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898):**

#### **I. Background:**

1. Bismarck, who ranks among the greatest heroes of German history, and among the most important statesmen of the modern world, assumed power at the age of 47 with slender experience of political affairs, but a decade’s experiences of German and European diplomacy. His character was much determined by his training, his family and his class background.
2. He was born in 1815 in the Protestant Junker estate in Brandenburg. A massive man of stiff military bearing, he had a quick, sensitive mind, great personal charm, acute intelligence, and indomitable will power. He was by nature passionate and volcanic, a man of action. He was brought up to combine the aristocratic traditions of his class with the enthusiastic patriotism.
3. Though born into a family of landowning gentry, Bismarck was in fact brought up in Berlin in contact with the Hohenzollern court. He had a short career in the civil service for “deficiency in regularity and discipline”; then eight years of work as a somewhat unsuccessful rural landowner, and at the age of 30 seemed to be a failure. He was saved from frustration only by happy marriages and family life.

#### **II. His political career:**

1. In 1847 Bismarck started his political career as a member of the Prussian Diet in Berlin. There he opposed every liberal proposal and made a name for himself as a determined reactionary.
2. During the revolutionary upheaval of 1818-49 Bismarck consistently defended the existing Prussian state against the liberals. He offered to bring his peasants to Berlin to protect Frederick William IV. He welcomed the end of the Frankfurt Assembly, and the restoration of the old Bound. His concern, first and foremost, was with the national interests of the Prussia state. The failure of the Frankfurt Assembly to unify German confirmed his belief of the strength of monarchy and the use of force. Thus he declared his conviction in blood and iron to solve the ‘great issues of the day.’
3. In 1851 Bismarck entered his King’s diplomatic service. As Prussian representative in the reconstituted Diet of the German Confederation from 1851 to 1859, he learned the arts of diplomacy and deepened his earlier dislike of Austria. He saw the possibility of German unity under Prussian leadership, and became convinced that clash between Prussia and Austria was inevitable. As ambassador at St. Petersburg, he won the warm regard of the Tsar. As Prussian ambassador at Paris in 1862, he obtained a pretty accurate insight into the complexities of Napoleon III’s character. In September 1862 he was appointed as Chancellor.

**III. His ideas:**

Bismarck's ideas were based on three themes:

1. By birth in the Junker class, he was conservative and opposed democracy.
2. As the Junker class furnished the bulk of the army officers, his outlook was necessarily militant. The loyalty of the Junker class to the Prussian crown made him a strong monarchist opposed to any republican form of government.
3. His Prussianism was deep as a Junker and he would not agree to Germany unified which involved less of Prussian and Junker ascendancy. His concept of 'nationalism' envisaged only a Germany unified by Prussian conquest, a united Germany dominated by Prussia and unified Germany emerged by the expansion and aggrandizement of Prussia. One aim he therefore never pursued - that of uniting all Germans in one single national state. His aim was Prussianisation of Germany. Prussia would be preserved and also the Junker class in Prussia. Both would not be absorbed and merged into a unitary Germany. And if eventually a strong unified state emerged, it was mere as a by-product of his success in the realization of his aims than as success of German nationalism.

**IV. Lesson learnt from the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament:**

1. Bismarck learnt from the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament that liberalism and majority votes could solve no great issue. 'It was necessary that German should look not to liberalism but to her own power. The great issues of the day could not be solved...but by 'blood and iron'. He believed that such a union must not come about by democratic elections but by force. He realized that Austria was the first obstacle to his plan for unification.

**V. Bismarck's method was clear:****A. Force, War, Blood and Iron:**

1. He was militant from his background, the Junker class supplying the bulk of army officers in Prussia.
2. He learnt from the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament that liberalism and majority votes could solve no great issue. 'It was necessary that Germany should look not to liberalism but to her own power. The great issues of the day could not be solved ...but by blood and iron.'
3. He knew well the principle the 'nothing succeeds likes success'. He was right to believe that gun could convert many enemies into admirers.
4. In view of the nature of obstacles, force was the only possibility. It could never be anticipated that Austria would be persuaded to give up her role of leadership or consent to a united Germany under Prussia. Compromise, discussion, agreement on the subject was impossible. Like wise, France would not want a strong and unified Germany on her border or allow the aggrandizement of Prussia. These she could never be persuaded to accept peacefully. The only way to overcome those was therefore force. 'Might is right.' It was so often said.
5. Bismarck's close association with Roon and Moltke caused him to look to war and militarism.



**B. Economic back-up:**

Yet behind the strength of the army there must be the strength of great industrialism. Therefore Bismarck also relied on 'coal and iron.'

1. Industries would supply the war-guns and clothes of the army.
2. Railways would facilitate movement and mobilization of troops.
3. The close alliance with industrialists of his own class tended to be another factor. (for details, see next section)

**C. Diplomatic isolation:**

1. Knowing too well that Prussia could not fight all the enemies combines, Bismarck would knock out the enemies in their turn. To ensure success in each case, he would isolate the enemy by diplomacy. That would reduce danger of fighting a combination and suffering defeat. Therefore his wars would only start after isolation of the enemy was accomplished. (see 1866 war and 1870 war). He was also such an expert in the game of diplomatic intrigues.

**D. Autocratic policy:**

1. He did not rely on the strength of parliamentary government. He trusted only in an efficient bureaucracy directed by the strong hand of himself and assisted by a loyal and strong army. Thus for the years 1862-67 he ignored the Diet, collected the necessary taxes and proceeded with his plans of army reorganization.

**E. Inspiration of nationalism by wars:**

1. He had no personal liking for 'bread' nationalism but he would use it to serve his purpose: conquest of Germany by Prussia. This was soon in the war of 1864 and 1870 when nationalism was used against Denmark, and France and drew into his fold the South German States.

## Steps by which Bismarck brought about the unification of Germany:

### Part I. Internal Reforms

#### A. Political aspects:

1. “Might, not right”. The immediate question which to deal was the question of the supremacy of King or Parliament in Prussia. His first duty was to defeat the liberal majority in the Prussian parliament, but underlying that question was the far more important one of future of Germany. Bismarck was determined that ‘Prussians we are Prussian we must remain.’ The liberals looked for the Parliamentary methods of 1848 to achieve a democratic liberal Germany but Bismarck differed from them. Bismarck wanted Germany to be united through submission to Prussia and the union was to be carried through military force. It was **“might, not right”** that counts.
2. The most practical step was the formation of the German National Association of 1859, an active political organization in the northern and Central Germany. It stood for the Little German solution of unification by which Austria should be excluded from Germany, and that the New Germany be united under Prussian leadership. Some of the leaders were prepared to make sacrifice of a constitutional government in order to win national unity. Therefore, its slogan stated, “better the stiffest Prussian military rule than the evil of the small states.”
3. When the lower house of the Parliament continued to refuse to vote the army budget, Bismarck solved this problem by ignoring the Parliament and illegally collecting taxes to finance the military program to increase and reorganize the Prussian army so that it was strong enough to win any war it undertook. There was a case for a larger military establishment, if Prussia was to live up to her status as a “great power” and to live down the diplomatic humiliations of recent years. Bismarck had no hesitation in violating the constitution, for he despised liberalism and parliamentary assemblies and believed in order, service and duty. For four years he continued to oppose the will of the lower house and the vast body of public opinion which supported it. As a result he became the most hated person in Prussia.
4. Nonetheless, it is wrong to say that liberalism played no role in shaping the German unification. Meanwhile the Prussian politics was of importance. In 1860, a new liberal party called the Progressive Party was founded. It aimed at the establishment of a Germany with a centralized power in the Prussian hand, but it still clung to the 1848 liberal principle of parliamentary control over administration. In 1862, Bismarck had to increase taxes for military expenditure without a parliamentary consent and this behavior of him was then generally viewed as unconstitutional. In the political crises which followed, the mounting liberal opposition in the Prussian parliament threatened the existence of Bismarck’s ministry. It was to save the Hohenzollern’s autocratic rule and his own power that Bismarck resolved on the policy of undermining liberalism by giving satisfaction to the popular demand for national unity and coupling it with intoxication of military glory. Hence, it brought the war with Denmark in 1864. Nonetheless, the Gastein settlement of 1865 did not quite appease the liberals, for in February 1866 a vote of censure on confidence in ministry was passed by the Prussian Diet indicating that autocratic rule might be

overthrown. Once again, Bismarck sought to put down political unrest at home by waging a war with Austria. In truth, **it was the liberal opposition at home that compelled him to take up the cause of German unity.**

**B. Military aspects:**

1. Annual army intake was increased, while intensive military training raised the general standard of efficiency. Military budget was also increased, while strategic railways were built and new weapons and needle guns were invented and manufactured.
2. The Prussian army was to be developed until it was strong enough to defeat Austria. In fact, Prussian military power was to be the chief factor in unifying Germany, for the Hapsburg Emperor would not voluntarily surrender the German supremacy. With the reformed army, however, Prussia should be able to beat Austria. Thus, Bismarck aimed to challenge Austria first for the leadership of the German states.

**C. Economic reforms:**

1. The Prussian-styled Agrarian revolution not only increased productivity but also provided the factories with raw materials.
2.
  - i. After 1848, under the influence of the Protectionist theories of List, the Prussians erected new tariff barriers against other member states of the Zollverein and completely excluded Austria from the organization. Prussianization resulted in great resentment of the German states who fought against Prussian in 1866.
  - ii. As a result of Prussian opposition, Austria never succeeded in her attempts to transform from the German Customs Union into a Mid-European Union, nor was she able to form the Austro-German custom union.
  - iii. Palmer argues that the Zollverein led to Germany's railway system centering upon Berlin, which had obvious political and military consequences.
3. Germany economy in this period had a significant progress:
  - i. By 1850 there were 6,000 km of railway. The following two decades saw the speedy construction of railways. This helped break down provincial barriers, brought town and country nearer and underlined the need for national unification.
  - ii. The volume of foreign trade per head doubled between 1851 and 1857, and again from 1865 to 1868. From 1853 to 1856 some joint stock banks and limited companies of considerable size were established to provide finance for industry. There was a tendency towards joint-stock banks. Both supplied much capital to the country.
  - iii. Until 1870 both industrial and primary commodities were exported and imported in roughly equal quantities.
  - iv. As a result of industrial development, by 1871 the town-dwellers of Prussia had arisen from 1/4 to 1/3 of her population. The rise of a prosperous class of merchants, bankers and industrialists led to the formation of chambers of commerce in towns. They were in favor of political change.
4. Industrial development was fostered side by side to back the army expansion. Plans of future campaign were carefully discussed. The high command was efficient and great attention was paid to case of army movement.

## Part II. Skillful Diplomacy

### A. Disraeli's Report

1. In 1862 it was reported that Bismarck had made the following remarks to Disraeli, the leader of the Opposition, when Bismarck was in London:
  - i. 'My first care will be to reorganize the army';
  - ii. "Then I will take the first opportunity to declare war with Austria... and give Germany a national union under the leadership of Prussia."
2. According to this report, as late as in 1862 Bismarck had planned the unification or, more exactly, the Prussianization of Germany.

### B. The Prussian-Danish War, 1864-65: (German-Danish War)

#### I. Background:

1. After considerable progress of his internal reform, Bismarck had to deal with Austria, his largest enemy, in unification. Bismarck had to find a pretext for war with Austria. He found in the crisis which arose in the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein in 1863. The problem of Schleswig-Holstein, hence became the main cause of the war.
2. These duchies, ruled by the King of Denmark but peopled mainly by Germans, had been a cause of dispute in 1848 between Germany and Denmark. Prussia had then championed the German cause; and through the diplomatic intervention of other great powers, a compromise was arranged in the Treaty of London 1852 highly favorable to Denmark: the duchies were not to be incorporated in the kingdom of Denmark, but the King of Denmark would remain their sovereign, though Holstein was left as a member of the German Bound. German nationalists resented the subjection of the two duchies to Denmark.
3. What revived the dispute in 1863 was disputed succession to the Danish throne and the desire of the Danes to incorporate Schleswig, which had a large Danish population. The old king died in November 1863 and in accordance with the agreement of 1852 was succeeded by Prince Christian of Glucksburg. The new king, following the policy of his predecessor, tried to change the administration of the duchies and to annex Schleswig. This immediately met with nationalistic outcry from the Bundestage of Frankfurt on behalf of Germany. Why, they asked, should the German minority in southern Schleswig be annexed to a foreign power, and permanently lost to the German fatherland? A rival to the Danish throne, Frederick of Augustenburg, who had never accepted the Treaty of London, helped German intervention. The Bundestage decided to back him and go to war.
4. Bismarck wanted such war, but he wanted it to be waged by Prussia and Austria in alliance, not by the whole German Bound. He was that for Prussia to make a successful war against Denmark in 1864 would indicate future leadership, and would raise Prussia prestige. By making war on Denmark, he hoped to arouse German nationalism. To act jointly with Austria was both inevitable and desirable; because

Austria would never agree to let Prussia act alone, and he was not yet ready to defy her. Any Prussian-Austrian settlement of so thorny a problem would leave ample room for picking a quarrel with Austria later whenever he chose. He also wished to try out the reorganized Prussian army and test its weapons. He wished to observe the Austrian army at close quarters, for he knew that the next war would be against Austria.

5. Facing the open defiance of the Treaty of London of 1852 the other powers were materially affected because Prussian and Austrian action had forced a small state to surrender territories that were generally regarded as a likely source of international dispute. But each of three, for different reasons, did not take any action.
  - i. In Britain, Lord Palmerston blustered (spoke in a forceful way), but Queen Victoria, a majority of his cabinet, and the opposition were all against any specific action.
  - ii. Napoleon III had become more and more involved in the difficult entanglement of the Mexican expedition, which committed French troops to trying to keep Maximilian on the throne of Mexico. He was at that moment in neither the mood nor the position to exert pressure on Austria and Prussia.
  - iii. Russia exercised no restraining influence because she had taken the precaution of ensuring her friendly neutrality. Bismarck had assured the Tsar of support against the Polish insurrection in 1863, which had threatened to attract British and French sympathies against Russia. Alexander II, grateful for Bismarck's backing against the Poles, was now willing enough to reciprocate as regards the Danes.
  - iv. The new kingdoms of Italy had neither the prestige nor the inclination to engage herself against Prussia and Austria together. Bismarck had timed his actions with great insight and skill.
6. In 1864 the Austro-Prussian Alliance was formed. There was joint military action against Denmark, who was soon defeated.

## II. Results

1. Two duchies were jointly occupied by Prussia and Austria. In 1864 Schleswig-Holstein were ceded to the German States. Having annexed the 2 duchies, there aroused the question of their division. The suggestion of Austria was that both of them should be handed over to the Duke of Augustenburg but rejected by Prussia.
2. By the Convention of Gastein in August 1865, Prussia took Schleswig to administer. Austria took Holstein to administer, but the future fate of the duchies remained a joint responsibility.
3. However, it should be noted that Prussia gave up the duchy 'Holstein' which populated by Germans. That meant Prussia had the right and excuse to annex Holstein from Austria and according to the principle of nationalism. As A.J. Taylor said, "It was simply a calculated step by Bismarck on the path towards an inevitable war." On the one hand Bismarck offered alliance to Austria and on the other prepared for war against Austria. In other words, although Bismarck had made an alliance with Austria before the Prusso-Danish War, his real intention was to make use of the war start a quarrel with Austria.
4. After the Convention of Gastein 1864, Austria felt that her position in Holstein was not secure and she began to encourage the claim of the Duke of Augustenburg.

Bismarck asked Austria to stop propaganda in Holstein in favor of the Duke Augustenburg but was refused. The Prussian troops then entered Holstein and then turned out the Austrians. Then the Austro-Prussian War 1866 broke out and finally led to the establishment of the North German Confederation.

5. It also proved the success of military reform of Prussia. After all, Bismarck believed that her military strength was strong enough and thus encouraged his future unification movement.
6. The victory of Prussia in the war proved her leadership in the German Confederation. Since then, the member states became more and more relied on her and recognized her as the leader of the new German Empire. Also, it proved the excellent diplomacy skill of Bismarck.

### C. Austro-Prussian War (Seven Weeks' War) 1866:

#### I. Background:

1. Prussian leadership in Little Germany
  - i. Bismarck aimed at establishing Prussian hegemony in the part of Germany to the north of River Main. This was in with Badowitz's plan of 1849, envisaging the establishment of an unified Germany which corresponded roughly to the scope of the then existing Zollverein.
  - ii. This required war to exclude Austria though she was Germanic. It was because Austria was the leader of Confederation and would not allow Prussia to replace her and it was because Bismarck's concept of German nationalism was Germany under Prussian domination. Confronted with the claims of the Prussian Progressive Party, Bismarck settled in 1862 on the policy of overcoming the internal opposition by attracting the public attention to a foreign war. Bismarck sought to retain the conservative alliance with Austria and to foster annexation sentiments in Schleswig-Holstein.
2. Complete Preparation
  - i. Two years of rest after the Danish War 1864 were sufficient. In the Danish War 1864, the Austrian arms had been observed and Bismarck was confident of Prussian victory in the case of war. The same war of 1864 had also tested the Prussian arms. The military reforms in defiance of Parliament had worked success.
  - ii. Austria was isolated as a result of Bismarck's skillful diplomacy:
    - In Britain, Palmeston had died and the new government was more inclined to the safety-first policy.
    - Bismarck was already on good terms with Tsar Alexander II of Russia. Moreover, in the Crimean War, Austria did not help Russia. Thus Russia would remain neutral.
    - In order to keep Napoleon III from intervening on the side on Austria in the coming struggle, Bismarck had a meeting with Napoleon III at Biarritz in October 1865. Bismarck succeeded in persuading the French Emperor that in the event of war between Prussia and Austria, France should adopt a policy of neutrality. Napoleon was foolish enough to believe that the outcome of a war would be the exhaustion of both parties and an opportunity for France to act as mediator. It was suggested further, that in return for his neutrality, Napoleon III might expect territorial rewards on the

eastern frontier of France. So Bismarck had no fear of intervention from that quarter.

- It only remained to secure the cooperation of the new kingdom of Italy. Bismarck made a secret agreement with Italy in which he promised that Italy would get Venetia if she joined Prussia in an attack on Austria provided that the war took place within three months of the agreement.

3. Schleswig-Holstein Question:

- i. With Austria isolated, Bismarck provoked Austria into war - for it was a principle of his policy to make his opponents the aggressors - by making use of Austrian policy in Schleswig-Holstein. Bismarck accused Austria of continuing to support the Duke of Augustenburg's claim to the duchies since the Conference of Altona in April 1866, and stirring up trouble for Prussia in Schleswig. Bismarck denounced it as violation of the Gastein Convention and ordered Prussian troops to march into Holstein and annexed it.
- ii. Bismarck followed this up by proposing in the Frankfurt Diet that the constitution of the German Confederation be reconstructed, a reform that would exclude Austria from German affairs. His proposal was an open defiance of Austria that war was now a question of time.
- iii. Austria retaliated by accusing Prussia of breaking both the Treaty of Vienna and the Convention of Gastein, and demanding the mobilization of the federal German forces against her. Austria was supported by nine out of the fifteen states, including Hanover, Saxony, Baden, and Bavaria. War was declared in June 1866.

In many ways, the war was Bismarck's working. The king only gave way to war after hesitation and Parliament had opposed strongly to the war. Nonetheless the war was inevitable in Bismarck's scheme. To Moltke, "it was a war even long foreseen, prepared with deliberation, and recognized as necessary by the cabinet, not in order to obtain territorial aggrandizement but in order to secure the establishment of Prussian hegemony in Germany."

## II. Course

The war began on 14 June 1866. After only three weeks it resulted in the defeat of Austria and her German allies. On 3 July the Austrians were decisively defeated in the battle of Sadowa (or Kenigaratz) which ended the campaign. In Lombardy strong Austrian forces defeated the Italians in Custozza. The Italian fleet was also defeated. Bismarck was anxious to make peace as quickly as possible. This was typical of his intelligence and statesmanship which was never rash. He did not wish to humiliate Austria further and make of her a dangerous enemy in the future. His main concern was to avoid the alliance of France and Austria. If Austria were treated harshly and Napoleon III frightened by Prussia's success, this alliance would be inevitable. He therefore decided, against William I's wishes, to treat Austria leniently, and to delay the complete union of Germany by leaving the South German States independent. The latter decision would conciliate the southern states and allay Napoleon III's hostility.

Austria was quickly defeated for several reasons:

1. Austria was in no condition to face a great war. Her finances were in a hopeless state; Hungary was rebellious; the army was badly organized and armed with out-of-dated muzzle-loading guns.

2. The Prussian army had been trained by von Roon and von Moltke and was armed with new rapid-firing needle-gun. As it was rapidly mobilized and capably commanded, it was the most formidable army in Europe. In this aspect, it showed the success as well as importance of military reform under Bismarck.
3. Although the Austrians defeated the Italians, 150,000 Austrian troops had been drawn away to the Italian front and this considerably weakened the Austrian forces facing the Prussians.
4. Bismarck's diplomacy had isolated Austria before the war broke out.

### III. Results of the War:

1. Treaty of Prague (August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1866):
  - i. In August 1866, Bismarck forced the Prussian king to conclude the Treaty of Prague with Austria, ending the Austro-Prussian War. This treaty was surprisingly **lenient**.
  - ii. Austria had to cede Venetia to Italy and Holstein to Prussia, to pay a small war indemnity, and to consent to the dissolution of the German confederation and the creation of a North German Confederation of which Prussia would be the head and from which Austria would be excluded. Thus while the new Italy was absorbing more Italians, a large number of Germans - the Austrian-Germans - were being cut off from the new Germany. It was in the reshaping of Germany that the real importance of the treaty lay. The old Confederation of 1815 was finally dissolved, another violation of one of the decisions of the Congress of Vienna of 1815.
2. Prussia had all she wanted:
  - i. The power to expel Austria from German affairs. Bismarck's greatest triumph by this war was the formation of the North German Confederation which included all the states north of the river Maine. Prussia annexed Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, Hesse-Cassel and Massau which were north German states. Prussia had unified more than half of Germany under her leadership. Austria was excluded. The King of Prussia was President and Bismarck was Chancellor.
  - ii. Home affairs were left almost entirely to the individual states, but matters of foreign policy were placed in Prussian hands. Prussia had controlled the military forces of all the members of the new Confederation, an important factor in his plan to make war on France.
  - iii. There was to be a parliament called the Reichstage in which each man had a vote. The head of this body was the Chancellor who was responsible to the President not the Reichstage. Furthermore, a Council (Bundesrath) was set up, consisting of representatives of all individual states. Germany was to be modeled not upon the liberal democracy of the West but upon the military despotism of Prussia.
3. South German states remained independent:
  - i. The South German states would remain independent and they were permitted to form a separate confederation. King of Prussia had wanted territory from Saxony and South German states. Only Bismarck wisely decided not to provoke France into a war before he wanted it and alienate South German states for future use and successfully resisted the king. The South German states



were let off easily and lightly. The South German states suffered no loss of territory. They were permitted to have their own organization.

- ii. By emphasizing the common nationality, by association in the Zollverein, by championing the interests of Germany against France over French demand for Rhineland compensation and Luxemburg, by giving military glory to the German name and by the generosity and leniency shown to them and Austria after 1866, South German states signed treaties of defensive alliance with the North German Confederation after joining in the Zollverein to form a customs Parliament called Zollparliament. Eventually they would lean on Prussia.
  - iii. The war and its victorious conclusion had justified Bismarck's policy at home. The army for which the Prussian king and his ministers had struggled, had brought glory to Prussia and shame to their enemies at home. A bill of indemnity by the Parliament which a year earlier had voted to censure government action in war, now approved of expenses of government previously without consent of the Lantag. It was done in gratitude of what Bismarck had achieved for Prussia. This did split the liberals. The majority supported Bismarck as the new 'National Liberal Party.'
  - iv. The war proved Bismarck's wisdom- declining to march on Vienna or to take Austrian Silesia or South German Land. It proved him wise also to isolate Austria, to bribe France into neutrality and to force South Germany into union. It proved his method of 'blood and iron' right and him as master-mind. It proved that king's greatness of character in listening to Bismarck. It proved also Moltke's generalship and genius as a soldier.
4. To France
- i. France offered mediation which Bismarck accepted only one condition that peace terms be determined before armistice, thus allowing France no chance to intervene to gain. Napoleon was unprepared. His armies were tied down in Rome and Mexico. He had expected the war to be long. He was also taken ill. Therefore he yielded, accepting Prussian terms in the Peace of Nickelsburg (later the definite Treaty of Prague). French prestige was damaged, and brought nearer the fall of the Second Empire.
  - ii. France had expected a long war, exhausting both parties and allowing her to impose designs on both. The war just ending in 7 weeks was a defeat of her policy. Her calculations were wrong.
  - iii. French demands for compensation were rejected. France wanted her 1814 frontier including the Rhineland compensation were rejected. Then Benedetti (French ambassador) was instructed to seek Prussian consent to the Belgian to protect Belgium from foreign interference. He was induced to put down demands in writing as the Benedetti Treaty but was then evaded. (This was later communicated to the British *Times* to alienate Britain from France three years later. Purchase of Luxemburg as compensation from Dutch king to balance Prussian gains was upset by Prussian rejection backed by German national feeling.) War was only avoided by mediation of Britain and Russia. Of course these demands were used to induce South German states to conclude with Prussia military alliances in the event of a French attack. France therefore was defeated at Sadowa. Also the empire was weakened. More liberal concessions followed. Since France failed to get compensation, balance of power in Europe was changed in favor of Prussia. The 1870 war was in sight as France

was humiliated and also feared Prussian expansion. Prussia went on to unify south Germany but this France would not follow.

5. To Austria

- i. Greater leniency to Austria was shown. There was extracted from the absence of indemnity. Austria suffered no loss of territory, and no army of occupation. Furthermore Vienna was not entered. The gratitude of Austria caused her disinclined to fight against Prussia in 1870 though there were other causes too. Nonetheless, her leadership of the German states was ended forever, since she had been driven out of Germany and Italy she then began to take a new interest in the Hapsburg dominions themselves.
- ii. 1866 marked the beginning of a new era particular in the history of Austria. Defeat made it necessary to come to term with the forces of disruptions and discontent within the Empire. She lost the leadership in Germany and it was then too weak to dominate Hungary. Most Magyars decided that a federation of Hungary and Austria was wiser than a complete break between the Empire. The Emperor was then forced to yield to their demands. In 1867 the “Ausgleich” compromise was accepted by Austria and Hungary. Austria and Hungary was separated, each had its own Diet. The Emperor of Austria was to be also the King of Hungary. There was to be a joint assembly which met alternatively in Vienna and Budapest to deal with financial, foreign and military matters. Half of its 120 members were appointed by the Austrian diet and half by the Hungarian one. This new state became known as the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary. It remained in existence until the end of the WWI.
- iii. In the foreign policy also Austria underwent a change. Henceforth, she abandoned the idea of domination in Central Europe and turned her eyes to the East, to the prospect of succeeding to the Turkish Empire in the Balkans. And so began the long rivalry with Russia which was to culminate in the Great War.

D. Franco-Prussian War 1870:

I. Background

A. Causes on the part of France (France’s responsibility in causing the war: large or small extent?)

1. After 1866 war between France and the new North German Confederation was inevitable. It was, as Bismarck once commented, “in the logic of history.” France was alarmed at the success of Bismarck. Napoleon III was afraid to see the creation of a strong national state on her eastern frontier. He was determined to fight rather than allow any further extension of Prussian power. France was jealous of Prussian success and aggrandizement. The Franco-Prussian War was much based on this **jealousy**.
2. A unified Germany would be the logical outcome of Prussian conquest and expansion and this must involve France in war as Napoleon long desired the natural frontier of the Rhine and it was so true because Napoleon after 1866 had asked for Rhineland as compensations and for vague hints of these had agreed at Biarritz to remain neutral- 1866. In the older conceptions of a balance of power, such com-

pensation was reasonable and conventional. In the new world of Realpolitik however there were no grounds for expecting compensation except at the point of bayonet. Napoleon III, now an ill and failing man, was already old-fashioned and out-dated. In thinking that the balance of power could be redressed by diplomatic bargaining instead of by superior force, Napoleon was profoundly mistaken.

3. France also wanted European balance of power preserved. A war with Prussian was necessary to prevent this from being further upset by Prussia. For failing to receive compensation for Prussian expansion after 1866, the balance of power tipped in Prussian favor and fear of France was roused. The war was therefore fought to maintain European balance of power.
4. Napoleon was faced with opposition at home. To divert attention and to gratify these elements opposing him, glory had to be sought and the war served well the purpose. It would not only divert opposition and unite the nation behind him, but would also be able to strengthen his position by glory and victory.
5. The Empress Eugenie was anxious for a victorious war to save the tottering Empire for her son. The war party at court added to the impetus. After all the clerical faction favored Austria and inclined to condemn Protestant Prussian. French opinion regarded Sadowa as a French defeat. After all, France must avenge on Prussia for the humiliation suffered after 1866 in the hands of Bismarck. Bismarck had rejected French say in the Peace of Nickelsburg, and had refused to support French protection over Belgium and had upset French purchase of Luxemburg. France had to revenge on Prussia on these reasons.

**B. Causes of Prussian part (Prussia's responsibility: large or small?)**

1. Bismarck also desired a war with France. Germany had had long-standing grievances against France because of the **bitter memories** left by the conquest of Germany by Napoleon I and also France had always endeavored to keep Germany weak and divided.
2. To Bismarck, the war was inevitable if he was to unify Germany under Prussia. France stood in the way. Napoleon declared that further union of the three parts of North German Confederation, South German states and Austria would be opposed and if Bismarck should venture to "touch the South German states, French guns would be off by themselves." Yet Bismarck wanted unification and a Germany demanded that the war lay in the logic of history. It was necessary in the interest of Prussia and German unity. Bismarck believed France would oppose Prussia's growing power.
3. He thus wanted to strike at her at a time convenient to Prussia not to France. As Bismarck would envisage, a war against a common enemy would unite the whole of Germany behind Prussia. A war with France would arouse a national spirit in Germany so that the south German states- Bavaria, Wurtemberg and Baden would surrender their independence and to unite themselves with the North German Confederation, to feel the necessity of Prussian protection and to realize that German unity was strength in face of French menace, overcoming cultural and religious differences, and attachment to state rights.
4. Even before the Treaty of Prague was signed, Bismarck had been busy **staging the next series of diplomatic maneuvers** which would complete the political unification of Germany under Prussia:
  - i. Bismarck signed treaties with Bavaria and other southern states that opened them to Prussian influence.

- ii. The first clash between France and Prussia came over the question of Napoleon III's rewards for his neutrality in the Seven Weeks' War. Napoleon III began to ask Bismarck for compensation as promised in the Biarritz interview in 1865. By so doing, he brought about the revival of nationalism among the Germans, particularly those in the south German states;
  - Napoleon III had not calculated on the proficiency of the Prussian army. The speedy and overwhelming Prussian victory thwarted his plans to act as mediator. Before the Treaty of Prague was signed, he had begun to demand territory on France's eastern frontier as compensation for having remained neutral. This would have meant the cession of territory belonging to the south German states. Although Bismarck was determined not to yield an inch of land, he encouraged the French ambassador Benedetti to put the demands in writing. Upon receiving them, Bismarck at once communicated them to the south German states. It was enough to cause the latter to throw themselves into the arms of Prussia. Secret treaties were arranged in which Prussia guaranteed their territory and they promised to put their armies under Prussian control in case of war.
  - After rejecting the French demand, Bismarck told Napoleon the possibility of obtaining non-German territory as a means of bolstering his tottering prestige. Benedetti then recognized the incorporation of the south German states in the North German Confederation if Prussia would assist her in acquiring Belgium. Bismarck then again made certain that these were put into writing. Nonetheless, Bismarck later published them at a moment when they served to scare Britain and Belgium into anti-French policies;
  - Again failed to obtain Belgium, Napoleon III wanted to buy some as to regain prestige. Then he wanted to get Luxemburg. The question was again complicated. By the treaty of 1839 Luxemburg was given to Holland and was garrisoned by Prussian troops. As Luxemburg had been a member of the old German Confederation, Bismarck was able to use the protests of enraged German nationalists as a reason for refusal, and all that Napoleon could obtain was the withdrawal of the Prussian garrison. This incident only intensified ill-will between the French and the Germans. Bismarck could then count on the support of the South German states. On the other hand, Bismarck was careful however, to conduct the whole affair without provoking the French too much. Though he believed a contest with France to be inevitable, he had to wait until the military party at Berlin was ready. When Napoleon himself renounced his scheme, it appeared as if the war cloud was lifted from Europe, but fresh provocation was soon to be supplied by the question of the Hohenzollern candidature for the vacant Spanish throne.
- iii. Bismarck did not really have to do anything to isolate France from Italy, for the Italians resented the presence of the French garrison in Rome stationed there since 1849. Besides, Italy had acquired Venetia through the help of Prussia;
- iv. England resented the French claims to Belgium, a claim revealed by Bismarck, as Belgium independence had been guaranteed by England. It was therefore very unlikely that she would help France in the event of war with Prussia.
- v. Russia was on friendly terms with Prussia on account of the personal friendship between Bismarck and the Russian Tzar, so that Russian neutrality was more or less assured. Besides Bismarck had strengthened this friendship by

promising to agree to tearing up of the Black Sea clause of the Treaty of Paris 1856. The Black Sea had been neutralized so that no warship, not even Russian, could be kept in the Black Sea.

- vi. Bismarck knew that Austria would not be in a position to help France. She had not yet recovered from the Austro-Prussian War. She had to watch Russia on her eastern frontiers. She felt grateful to Prussia for the moderate terms imposed on her in the Treaty of Prague.

### C. Immediate Causes: Spanish Succession Crisis and the Ems Telegram

1. In the first half of 1870, Prussia and France quarreled over the Spanish throne candidature. After Queen Isabella had been driven out in the 1868 Revolution, the Spaniards looked around Europe for a new ruler. The Spanish throne was offered at Bismarck's instigation to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a relative of the king of Prussia, who was the head of the Hohenzollern family.
2. Twice Leopold refused the offer. When, however, it was renewed in 1870, he accepted it. As it was expected that Leopold's accession in Spain would bring still further gains both in prestige and in material benefit to Prussia, it was welcomed in Prussia and equally warmly opposed in France. France feared encirclement, should Hohenzollern rule on both the Rhine and the Pyrenees.
3. On 6<sup>th</sup> July the French Foreign Minister announced that unless the Hohenzollern candidate were withdrawn, France would treat the matter as a cause of war. Under diplomatic pressure and not reluctant to back down from so insecure a career as that of a Spanish monarch, Prince Leopold withdrew his candidature on 12<sup>th</sup> July. The French government regarded it as a diplomatic victory and moved a step forward deciding to demand from Prussia guarantees that the candidature would not be renewed, thus giving Bismarck the chance of Ems telegram.
4. Benedetti was instructed to seek such assurances personally from the king of Prussia and sought out William at Ems on 13 July presenting the demand. The king received him courteously but firmly refused to give any such guarantee. Later he even sent one of his aids to Benedetti to say that he then regarded the affair as closed. A telegram was sent to Bismarck in Berlin, telling him what had taken place. There seemed no occasion here for war, and if not for Bismarck it would not have led to war.
5. Ems Telegrams
  - i. Bismarck wanted war and he strongly believed that the time was ripe. He bitterly deplored the king's mild behavior and regarded the events of 12 and 13 July as a humiliating surrender before French demands. At the time he received the Ems Telegram, he was dining with von Roon and von Moltke. All three, bent as they were on war, became greatly depressed.
  - ii. Bismarck had permission to inform the press and the Prussian embassies abroad if he wished. He slightly edited the telegram, and published it in the newspaper. The condensed version made it appear that the king's refusal to see Benedetti again was due not to his having heard news of Leopold's withdrawal, but to the very nature of Benedetti's original demands. It thus left with the German people the impression that the French ambassador had been insolent while it led the French to believe that their ambassador had been insulted.
  - iii. Both German and French public opinion were so sensitive and so excitable that when this news came out in the Press of both countries it caused hysterical

reactions. France felt insulted and clamored for war to avenge her honor; German opinion rejoiced at the king's defiance of unwarranted claims. On 19<sup>th</sup> July France finally declared war on Prussia and appeared as aggressor.

## II. Causes for Prussian victory:

A.J. Taylor: "a triumph of view, a triumph of planning, of fore-fought, of occasion direction."

1. The French people had been told by the Minister of War that everything was in readiness down to the last button of the last gaiter of the last soldier. According to Benedetti, the people received with transports of enthusiasm, when they heard of the news that war had been declared. Actually there had been little preparation for war. The war revealed an appalling state of inefficiency and confusion in the French military system. The railways were not prepared for transport, munitions were not ready; conscription had never been properly enforced, and the number of troops mobilized fell far short of expectation.
2. France also suffered from divided counsels. Marshall Macmahon commanded in Alsace, Marshall Bazaine in Lorraine, with no considered strategy to coordinate their actions. Napoleon III, courageously fighting his won physical weakness, was in no condition to unify the command. Division, shifting plan and tradition hampered the French efforts.
3. Empress Engenie exercised unwise influence. A retreat on Paris was a better plan from a military point of view, but was resisted by her for political considerations. Therefore Bazaine was forced to defend Metz and was shut up. Macmahon was likewise resisted and compelled to march to relieve Bazaine with the result that he was surrounded and forced to surrender at Sedan.
4. The calculated support from Italy and Austria failed to materialize. Italy did not help because she insisted on the evacuation of Rome and wanted a chance to seize the city garrisoned by French troops. Austria remembered the bitter defeat of 1866 and was still exhausted and did not forget the leniency received in the hands of Bismarck. Thus the Emperor declined to commit Austria to immediate action in a dispute between France and Prussia on a purely German issue. In this aspect, France stood alone, as sighed by the French prime minister.
5. The French armies were in general decisively inferior to the Prussian forces in arms, in generalship, and even in numbers. The Prussian army was scientifically organized. Prussian command was superior and united in Moltke. For two years von Miltke had been preparing for this campaign, and when the time came every detail was ready. Within three weeks of the mobilization order, nearly 500,000 German troops were concentrated on the French frontier, while the French had only half that number. From the very beginning, the German victory was certain.
6. Prussians were superior in artillery, scouting, geographical knowledge, in discipline, in initiative and in weapons. Indeed, the Prussian needle-guns were better than the French chesspot. The Germans had plenty of spirit and enthusiasm. Bismarck succeeded in making France appear as the aggressor by declaring war first.
7. The war had been kept as a duel, and involved no third power. It was the nemesis of Napoleon III's restless policy that France found herself friendless in Europe; it was the victory of Bismarck's policy that by judicious timing he contrived to isolate the conflict and prevent it becoming a wider European war.

#### IV. Results

1. After repeated failure, France was forced to sign the Treaty of Frankfurt in 1871. Accordingly,
  - i. France was to surrender to the Germans the province of Alsace and most of Lorraine;
  - ii. France was to pay an indemnity of 5 billion francs;
  - iii. A German army of occupation would remain until the indemnity was paid.
2. Creation of the autocratic Hohenzollern German Empire. The most striking result was the fulfillment of Bismarck's plan for the unification of Germany and the establishment of a German Empire under Prussian Hohenzollern leadership.
  - i. The war in which troops from the south German states fought side by side with those of the North German Confederation raised the sentiment for German unity to such a pitch that it swept away whatever dislike of joining with the northern states still existed in the south. By November 1870, while the war was still in progress, treaties of union were negotiated by Bismarck on behalf of the North German Confederation with the governments of the several South German States. These treaties, duly ratified by the parliaments, simply changed its name to the German Empire. The King of Prussia, instead of being 'President of the Confederation' was henceforth to be styled 'German Emperor.' On 18<sup>th</sup> January 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors in the Palace of Versailles, the King of Prussia was proclaimed German Emperor. The ceremony symbolized the eyes of the world the newly-born unity of the German people. Little Germany was unified.
  - ii. The Constitution of 1871, which was based on the Constitution of 1867, was adopted. Accordingly the Empire was confederation of states under Prussian hegemony; and it was in control of the armed forces, customs, commerce, transport and the postal services. Contributions corresponding to the need to increase the income of the imperial treasury were required by the federal states.
  - iii. The Bundersrat (Federal Council) which was composed of representatives of the States was set up. Nonetheless, as Taylor reviewed, it was never consulted on any important question. The Reichstag in which its members were elected by universal suffrage was founded. Nonetheless, the authority was very limited.
  - iv. Under the newly-born Germany, the General Staff responsible for military affairs was also under the direct command of the King. Moreover, the Imperial Chancellor, usually also the Prime Minister of Prussia, was the agent of the Emperor. He was the chairman of the Federal Council and supervisor of the secretaries of states and the imperial bureaucracy. It was democratic superficially but autocratic in reality.
3. It was a turning point in French history
  - i. The immediate effect of the French defeat was that the Second French Empire collapsed. The Paris Commune was set up as a sign of protests but soon was suppressed. After bitter fighting the riots were suppressed. The incident however left much bitterness, which exacerbated the relations between people of Paris and the Governments of France for thirty years, retarded French so-

- cialism by three decades, and provided international socialism with its fundamental martyrology.
- ii. The loss of Alsace-Lorraine signified the end of French hegemony in Continental Europe and sowed the seeds of Franco-German hostility in the subsequent half a century. In order to compensate psychologically, France, which was deliberately encouraged by Bismarck, actively engaged in colonial expansion. Hence it led to serious conflicts with other powers including Britain, Italy and even Germany.
  - iii. French vengeance on Germany explained why Clemenceau was so severe to Germany in the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.
4. Italy's complete unification
- i. The Franco-Prussian War enabled the Italians as well as the Germans to round out and strengthen their national state. On the eve of Sedan, Napoleon III, hard pressed for troops, withdrew the French garrison from Rome and left Pope Pius IX to defend his temporal rule as best he could with only the assistance of his personal guards and a small force of foreign volunteers.
  - ii. The government of King Emmanuel II, with Bismarck approval, ordered an Italian army of 60,000 men to invade and occupy the Papal State. A plebiscite ratified the appropriation of the Papal State by the Kingdom of Italy, and in 1871 Rome became the national capital. Italian unification was hence completed.
5. The Eastern Question
- i. The fall of Napoleon III permitted the undoing of another part of his work. In this instance, the Russian Tzar, also with Bismarck's benevolent approval, denounced in October 1870- the articles of the Treaty of Paris of 1856 which limited Russian naval forces and armaments in the Black Sea; and a conference of the powers, meeting in London in March 1871, formally assented.
  - ii. It was an omen of renewed Russian aggression against the Ottoman Empire. Thus the Eastern Question was revived when Russia felt once more her strength in the Black Sea. This was followed by her activity in the Balkans.
  - iii. Austria after the War found out that it was better to rely on Germany than to revenge on her. Henceforth Austria depended on German support to her expansion into the Balkans. In this sense the Austro-Russian conflict was inevitable and finally leading up to the Congress of Berlin 1878 and hence the First World War.
6. Effect on Europe as a whole
- i. The international situation was completely changed. There was a current saying that "Europe had lost a mistress, but had gained a master." The center of European gravity shifted from Paris to Berlin; and under the guidance of Bismarck the German Empire established a virtual hegemony over the Continent. This Bismarck became the fulcrum not only of Germany but also of European politics. The period of Bismarck was then to inaugurate.
  - ii. After the defeat of France, Bismarck regarded France the irreconcilable enemy of the German Empire and the inveterate disturber of European peace. Consequently the so-called Bismarckian nightmare led to the emergence of Alli-



ance system in order to isolate France. This defensive system later turned to aggressive one and finally led to the WWI.

- iii. Since the outstanding political issues were settled, European powers were free to expand outside Europe. In fact they had to, then that unification had little room for European territorial contest. This led to imperialism and war.
- iv. Coupled with this, the settlement to these problems of unification allowed the powers to turn to internal development. Industrialization after 1870 was marked. For example, German industrialization was facilitated and Germany became the most important Power of the world. This furnished impetus for expansion abroad to acquire colonies as sources of raw materials, markets and outlet for investment. Imperialism fostered and led easily to conflicts and war.
- v. The success of Bismarck in his object by 'Blood and Iron' was enough to give example and encouragement to Europe to settle their issues and differences by force instead of by negotiations. This paved the way for later armament race and the First World War.

## Assess the importance of the Zollverein and the 1848 Revolutions in history of the German unification.

The master-piece of Bismarck-the concept of Germany by Prussia, or some historians call it the 'unification of Germany' is always regarded under the direct influence of the Zollverein and the 1848 revolution. The 1848 Revolutions offered more constructive influence, but always associated with Bismarck's brilliant statesmanship. The 1848 Revolutions, including its results and consequences, were only raw materials. More importantly, Bismarck's policy was in some ways inspired by the revolutions. On the other hand, some effects of the revolution directly contributed for the foundation of German unification. The importance of the Zollverein and the 1848 Revolutions in the history of the German unification will be given as follows.

Zollverein was formed in 1834, it was a custom union between the German states. Prussia initiated such union. Naturally, she became the leader. Her rival, Austria was excluded. Some smaller states, such as Hanover, Oldenburg, Mecklenburg and the three Hansa towns remained outside after 10 years of its formation.

The Zollverein was almost the only serious event in the 'quiet years'. It should be pointed out that in a short run and also in some aspects it was not a step towards the unification of Germany, but a device for making the unification of Germany less necessary; it was the price which the German princes, including the King of Prussia, paid for continuing to exist. Moreover, it was an achievement of the princes, not of the peoples. The concessions which it involved were violently opposed in the Chambers of the lesser states; and if Prussia, who made the greatest financial concessions, had possessed a parliament, the Zollverein would never have been established. The Zollverein became, in time, a powerful instrument in Prussia's control of Germany. However the Prussian statesmen who made the Zollverein had not the slightest idea of its political consequences; they saw only the rambling, unworkable frontiers and desired to save money on their customs officers.

No one however, should minimize the importance of Zollverein. As Marriot and Robertson pointed out, "For the first time Germany became a fiscal and commercial unit." The Zollverein united the German states in bonds of mutual economic interests. It united them under the leadership of Prussia; and it accustomed them to the exclusion of Austria from the Germanic body. More important of all is that the semblance of political union was carefully avoided, but the germs of political union were nevertheless present in the growing community of material interests.

As Bowring stated, "the general feeling in Germany towards the Zollverein is that it is the first step towards what is called the Germanization of the people. By the community of interests on commercial and trading questions it had broken down some of the strongest holds of alienation and hostility and it has paved the way for a political nationality- it has subdued much local feeling and habit and replaced them by a wider and stronger element of German nationality." Again, patient, sagacious and even liberal in its negotiations with its weak neighbors, Prussia silently connected with itself through the ties of financial union States which had hitherto looked to Austria as their natural head. The reputation of the Prussian Government no less than the welfare of the Prussian people was advanced by each successive step in the extension of the Zollverein.

Thus, the German Customs Union, though in a short run retarded the unification, was in a long run important. This could be revealed by the argument of some historians such as Keyney that German was unified by coal and iron instead of blood and iron. Indeed, military and diplomatic works were not unimportant. Historians blamed that the 1848 revolutions had no resolute program, thus it failed, but Bismarck's 'revolution' had a perfect programs though without details. After 1849, we can notice that several distinctive features appeared.

German nationalism grew in this period, precisely Prussian patriotism rose. It could be reflected in two ways. First, the causes of the phenomenon was greatly due to the 1848 revolutions. After 1848-49, the monarchies were discredited, for their dishonesty in the Frankfurt Assembly and their reactionary policy. Bismarck knew that to make the dynasty to survive, national coloring was essential. Thus, such kind of dynastic nationalism grew. The Danish crisis 1864 was one of the stimulus for the national sentiment in Germany.

The Vienna Settlement and the old fashioned despotism were also destroyed in the revolution, Prussia escaped from the engagement of Holy Alliance. Vienna Settlement opposed German unification, and despotism retarded German liberal and national movement. Once the settlement was destroyed, they turned to the new slogans of 'nationalism'. Feudalism was abandoned in the Eastern Europe in 1848, the emancipated serfs went to the cities as laborers, and they began to approach nationalism. Since their minds are easily persuaded, they would feel a strong united country was better than lordship.

German revolution was fatal mainly because its participants were diversified into socialist, radical or other ideas. Bismarck realized that if "Prussia was divided by ideological fragmentation, unification could hardly succeed." Then he created a feeling of nationalism by provoking foreign threat, in Danish War, Austro-Prussian War and the Franco-Prussian War. His aim was achieved, a national sentiment grew between the people. Precisely, German nationalism began in 1863, the 1848 nationalism was pseudo-nationalism since the liberals only aimed at liberty but concerned little for national unity. Bismarck was the creator of German nationalism.

Liberalism and sovereignty of the people were stressed in the 1848 revolution. Liberalism was discredited due to the uncompromising attitude of the liberals who caused the revolution to die. The liberals only concerned with their own privileges in 1848 but ignored other demands. So many of them abandoned liberalism and turned to German patriotism. Bismarck diversified the masses mind from people's sovereignty to patriotism. They were induced to put the state at their first importance and abandoned their demand for liberty. The glory of Danish War and Seven Week's War once again made both the liberals and nationalists quiet.

Dictatorship was practiced in Germany after 1862, when Bismarck came to office. He ignored the parliament and increased the taxation for army expenditure. This was also caused by the 1848 revolution. In 1848, the parliamentary system was discredited by the inefficient Frankfurt Assembly. So the people tolerated the dictatorship of Bismarck. Moreover, Bismarck thought reversely that the Frankfurt Assembly gave a chance for the Germans to voice their opinion, he was afraid that democracy would grow, so he strictly controlled the parliament.

Another feature was the rise of rationalism and real politik which led to the belief of force and war. Rationalism was caused by the failure of Romanticism in 1848.

Sir Lewis Namica realized that the 1848 revolutionaries were dreamers, their romantic ideas contributed nothing to the revolution. Moreover, the revolutions were crushed by armies. People then realized that forces could determine anything. Practically they believed in forces more than theories after the revolution. They all believed that the aims of the 1848 revolution could not be achieved by manifestoes and barricades but by blood and iron. Even the most anti-invasion liberals also supported Bismarck after Sadowa 1866. Bismarck had the same opinion; even he realized that the political technique must be renewed. This was because the traditional belief in politics was changed. Politicians such as Castlereagh, Talleyrand could never be found; they stressed on peace, mutual help, balance of power and moral. However, the atmosphere of 1848 gave the politicians an idea that military strength could also be used. Thus, 'realpolitik' as advocated by Bismarck and Cavour appeared.

Prussian leadership began to be transformed from 1848 and completed in 1867. The downfall of Metternich caused a political vacuum, the strongest Prussia became the first choice though no one thought Prussia would be the leader before 1848. However, Prussia could not succeed Metternich immediately. Until 1867, Austrian's influence in Germany was almost expelled. The Prussian army acted as a protector in the 1848 Revolution, gave confidence to the princes. So, in 1870 the princes went to Prussia for protection when a crisis came.

Austria was seriously weakened since she had received great disturbances in Hungary and Italy. These two revolutions helped Prussia to assume leadership to a certain extent. Moreover, in the Frankfurt Assembly, the Archduke John was a poor leader. Since the princes had tasted the situation of leaderless, they were eager to seek one to replace the deteriorating old man. Prussia, then, largely due to the revolution of 1848 built up the foundation of her leadership.

In the 19th century, no country could achieve her independence or unification without foreign assistance. For instance, Greece, Belgium and Italy also got foreign help. Germany was not an exception. In the 1848 revolution, the revolutionaries failed partly because they had no foreign help. Bismarck knew the importance of foreign help especially when he wanted to expel some powerful elements from the country. At least the foreign powers' neutrality must be secured. In the Danish War, Bismarck had Russian neutrality. In the Seven Weeks War, he had French neutrality and in the Franco-Prussian war, he had Austrian neutrality. Moreover, he made use of the foreigner's national pride to fulfill his destiny. He defeated Denmark in 1863, Austria in 1866 and France in 1870. These three wars contributed a lot to the unification of Germany, but the idea was originated from the revolutions of 1848.

To conclude, while the Zollverein paved the way for political unification, the 1848 Revolution taught the Germans a good lesson. While the Zollverein consolidated the internal forces, the 1848 revolution guided the Germans to a correct direction. German nationalism after 1848 paved the way for the ultimate nation forming, army strength. 'Realpolitik' were definitely processed to achieve unification at that time. It can be said that both were rather significant to the ultimate success.

Bismarck declared: “The great questions of the day will not be decided by speeches or by majority decisions...but by blood and iron.” Was he right? Did blood and iron decide the course of German history in the 19th century?

Bismarck made the above comment after the failure of the Frankfurt Assembly aiming at unifying Germany (the great question of the day). But were speeches or majority decisions the main cause, or even one of the causes, of the failure? What is known, however, is that Bismarck did unify Germany. The means he employed were many and varied. “Blood and iron” was without doubt his main policy. Was this and its subsequent application the cause for his success?

After Napoleon’s conquest in the early 19th century that they were at that time scattered loosely in the form of the German Confederation, the German people wished to build their own nation. The Confederation included even the Austrian Empire, yet lacked leader. That is why during the Frankfurt Assembly, the first and most important question was to choose between a Great Germany including Austria or a Little Germany excluding Austria. People grew weary as time passed; their enthusiasm grew lukewarm. Without their support, the Assembly was little more than a debating hall. People wanted deeds, not words. This, however, does not necessarily mean that “words” were unimportant. The problem was a matter of tactics. The masses needed and asked for a plan with substance. The delegates failed to give them this. For among the delegates, “there was not sufficient interest at this time in unity for its own sake: everyone concerned had a particularist or class or personal axe to grind first.” The delegates failed to unify the multiplicity of the masses. In Theodore A. Hamberow’s words, “the Frankfurt Parliament could not reflect the multiplicity of interest of the German people.” Their failure was due to the inherent defects of the Assembly: “it was the creation of a liberal middle class resolved to make its dominant position secure in a new system of government.” Moreover, the delegates “lacked the genius for recognizing opportunity and swiftly taking time by the forelock. It forgot that in a wildly excited age history does not wait for the thinker, and so it was doomed to fail in everything.” As Bismarck remarked: “the great question of the day will not be decided by speeches or by majority decisions.”

The delegates of the Frankfurt Assembly were elite, professionals, and middle class. They saw the problems of unification and had the support of German people. But they lacked a mentality compatible with those who had real power to determine Germany’s fate. At one time, they offered the throne to the Prussian King, William I. He refused not because he did not want to be the king of Germany, but because he did not want to share power with the Assembly. That is why even though the delegates had support from below, they failed. Bismarck, by contrast, was a pragmatist. He knew that support from above was most critical. The masses had to be led, and he was to lead them. This pragmatist view of politics was central to his famous comment that “blood and iron” would dictate the course of events. Unlike the delegates, Bismarck had designed a plan for action.

Bismarck from the outset knew that the world was dominated and decided by realpolitik. Power politics dominated the thinking and mentality of the Powers.

Without military force, as it were, no unification of Germany was possible. The delegates at the Frankfurt Assembly regarded as dangerous by within France, Austria, or even the Prussian King, William I. It was doomed to failure from the very beginning. Bismarck knew this and acted accordingly. In the Crimean War, he secured the friendship of Russia, without provoking the other powers. This is exactly *realpolitik*. Prussia at that time was not a major Power in Europe. The other Powers let her alone. Fore here mere intention to unify posed a threat to the other Powers. Reason, or “words”, would not work here. What would work was the manipulation of the balance of power in Europe. Russia could be a potential rival in the North. Thus, Bismarck had to secure neutrality from Russia when he took any steps toward unification. That is why when the Poles rose up against Russia, Bismarck backed Russia. Nor could he afford to irritate the other Powers. Thus came neutrality.

Then came the question of Schleswig-Holstein. Bismarck tactfully lured Austria to make the two states a sphere of influence. In 1863, as suggested by the phrase “blood and iron”, Bismarck provoked a war with Austria ostensibly over the handling of the two states. “The world has to be presented with a *fait accompli*,” remarked a historian. The Seven Week’s War ended with Prussia acquisition of the Schleswig and Holstein. After this saw the creation of North German Confederation consisting of Frankfurt, Hanover, Nassau, and Hesse-Cassel. Bismarck’s plan did not end here, however. More blood had yet to be shed. In 1870, Bismarck tempted Napoleon to fight the Franco-Prussian War. Needless to say, Bismarck, before fighting the war, secured the neutrality of all the major Powers. He never fought a two-front war. He knew what politics in Europe at that time. France surrendered in September 1871, ceding Alsace, and most of Lorraine, to the new German state. Thus completed the unification of Germany.

Given the failure of the Frankfurt Assembly, and the success of Bismarck’s plan, the “blood and iron” policy was the product of his acknowledgment of *realpolitik*. *Realpolitik* means “political realism, especially policy based on power rather than ideals.” The delegates at the Frankfurt Assembly concerned with ideals resulted in failure. Bismarck, concerned with power, succeeded. It is true that Bismarck’s diplomacy and shrewd maneuver of events contributed to the successes. However, he could not make use of these means alone to achieve the end. Each time he moved, he had to resort to war: first with the Danes, then with the Austrians and finally the French. Without war, his shrewdness and diplomacy would have achieved little. Well before the Schleswig-Holstein affair, Bismarck had concluded that “the duchies could not be acquired without war.” Diplomacy could only serve as the background against which actions were to be taken to achieve the end. The great questions of the day indeed had to be discussed. But speeches and majority decisions could not and did not solve the great questions of the day. It was an age in which power politics, *realpolitik*, and military strength would decide events. “Blood and iron” was the only means by which the end could be met. The liberals not only those in Germany but also those in Italy, thought otherwise. They all failed, as they were doomed to do. European Powers at that time were thinking in terms of security and balance of power. Would France, Austria, Russia or any other Powers allow a strong rival at their borders? If they had allowed liberal means to achieve the end, whatever it was, then the revolutions of 1848 would have succeeded. And this might cause trouble to themselves. In short, Bismarck and his

colleague politicians would not allow “speeches and majority decisions” decide the course of event. The only means available was “blood and iron”.

## Discuss the role of economic development of Prussia in the German Unification.

J.M. Keynes stated that “The German Empire was built more truly on Coal and Iron than Blood and Iron.”. To him, the economic development of Prussia after 1820s was a decisive factor of German Unification 1870. In fact, the economic unity of Prussia eventually created a sense of political unity among the German states. It excluded Austria from the unification and ensured the predominance of Prussia in German Empire after 1870. In the following I would like to discuss the role of economic development in the German Unification.

The economic development of Prussia should be categorized into two aspects: the Customs Union and the internal reform of Prussia.

In Germany after 1850, the Industrial Revolution went at full speed. The production of coal increased from 3,000,000 tons in 1848 to nearly 30,000,000 in 1871, far exceeding that of Belgium and France combined. The manufacture of raw iron increased from 1,100,000 to 3,000,000 tons. From this rapid development the steels and ammunition makers obtained their strength, and Bismarck used it to accomplish his ends.

Early in 1839, the first important railway was established. After 1850 railway was extended till Germany had a system of 11,500 miles by 1870. The building of new iron tracks opened up the interior lands of Germany, brought chances to entrepreneurs and removed natural impediments to German integration. In 1847, there was a “Union of German Railways” means the railway networks with Berlin as center, improved the communication among states and helped the militarists to serve the strategic needs. From 1850 to 1870, the government raised 20 million pounds for railway construction.

Moreover in 1850 to 1871, there was a growth in the system of banking which played a vital part in mobilizing capital for investment in business and industry. 230 million was raised for new banks. So after 1871, it was possible for the Imperial to hold German banks into a formidable financial power.

Also, the Prussian-styled Agrarian Revolution not only increased productivity but also provide the factories with more new materials. It also led to the rapid growth of Prussian economy.

More importantly, in the economic field, Prussian took the lead by establishing the Zollverein. It had its root in 1818, developed into nearly an all-German economic association aiming at the promoting the fortunes of member states. In May 1818, after the “Protectionist theories of List”, an uniform tariff was imposed on all Prussian territories. Duties on trade between her own hands were abolished. This new law was a victory for the principle of free trade. The law abolished most internal customs barriers, and allowed most raw-material into duty free, imposed only 10% duty on manufactured goods. The new tariff, in the long run, made large scale economic expansion possible. Prussia quickly absorbed a number of tiny enclaves into her system. In 1834, a formal economic organization, Zollverein was established with membership of almost all German states excluding Austria and few other states.

In this way, German economic development and Prussian economic domination led to political unity. Firstly, with a growing industrial power, the new army was better equipped than that of any other country. The needle gun proved to be a success when put to test in the war with Denmark. The newly completed railway network which



ensured the high mobility of troops was the chief reason for the speedy victory snatched from Austria in 1866. Again, the superiority in heavy artillery proved invincible in the 1870 war during the Prussian invasion into France.

Besides, the establishment of Zollverein also made eventual unification of German possible. Firstly, it helped break down the provincial barriers and brought town and country nearer together and underlined the need for national unification.

Secondly, it's logical to conclude that without the setting up of Zollverein under Prussia, eventual unification might not have come in such early year of 1870 as resources might not have exploited and railways, industries might not have set up in such an early year of the 1840-50s. Thus military wars with Denmark, Austria and France might not have won which indirectly brought to unification.

Moreover, the establishment of Zollverein made small German states loyal to Prussia and thus sense of belonging was fostered as it was under the guidance of Prussia because Prussia seemed to bring wealth and glory to them. Thus, eventual unification was easier for it was set up by Prussia, not Austria. The Germans thought that the new ruler of German Empire should be Prussia instead of Austria. It clearly indicated that economic unification brought political unification.

To conclude, the role of economic development of Prussia in the unification was indeed very important. Without such development, Prussia would not be the leader of the unification movement and not she could defeated Austria and France so easily. However, if there was just internal and economic reforms, but no diplomacy, the unification would not be achieved in 1870. In fact, the unification 1870 was a combine product of "successful economic developments, skillful diplomacy, military reforms and favorable international condition."

## Cavour and Bismarck: similarities and differences

In 1870s, both German and Italian unification were completed. In both countries, able leadership played an important role in the final success. In drawing the picture of Cavour and Bismarck's contribution, it is inescapable to find out that their contribution and work were not all the same in certain aspects.

### Similarities

1. **Both learnt a lesson from the previous failure, and understood the importance of real politick.** Both statesmen learnt lessons from the failure of unification movement in 1830 and 1848 respectively. They understood well that only liberalism and nationalism could not solve the existing problems: the suppression from great powers. They understood that might is right. Cavour hence carried out a lot of internal reforms and sought foreign assistance. Bismarck also strengthened the internal military, economic powers and used skillful diplomacy to isolate the enemies.
2. **In the aspect of liberal development, both acted a negative role.**
  - i. It would be an exaggeration to say that Cavour contributed to constitutionalism and the strengthening of parliamentary democracy in Piedmont. He had no scruples in restoring to arbitrary and non-parliamentary means to secure his personal power. For example, he still joined the Crimean War in order to raise the international prestige of Piedmont despite the parliamentary objection. He defended Parliament because it made him strong rallying liberal support.
  - ii. Bismarck was ruthless in disregarding parliamentary ideals practices. For many times he disregarded the decisions made in parliament. For example, when the lower house of the Parliament continued to refuse to vote the army budget, Bismarck solved this problem by ignoring the Parliament and illegally collecting taxes to finance the military program to increase and reorganize the Prussian army so that it was strong enough to win any war it undertook. Like Cavour and despite his assertions on the absolute power of the Prussian king, he deliberately shaped the constitutional system of Germany in 1867 and 1873 to bolster his position as German Chancellor. Yet none of the two cared to build a political party system to gain predominance in Parliament.
3. **As diplomat both Cavour and Bismarck were talented, apt at exploiting the foolishness or rivalries of their enemies.**
  - i. Cavour calculated on the clash of French and Austrian ambition in Italy. (examples? Pact of Plombieres) Cavour nearly lost his game when Napoleon III deserted him by signing the Treaty of Villafranca with Francis Joseph of Austria. He prevented a total loss by his intrigues in the central duchies, and even gained the Papal States and the south of Italy by playing upon the fears for a republican revolution. However his dependence on France wrote off a least Venetia and Rome from the 1860 settlement in Italy.
  - ii. Bismarck isolated Austria by allying with Italy, and isolated France by exaggerating French pretensions in the Rhinelands. Bismarck however showed a firmer grasp of the realities and played with a sure card.
4. **Both believed in war to be an extension of diplomacy and a means for the ultimate solutions of issues between nations.**

- i. From the process of issues the first step taken by Cavour was to prepare a war with Austria. This proved that he regarded war as an important and effective way to complete the unification.
  - ii. From the Blood and Iron policy, it is clear that Bismarck regarded war as the essential way of unification. From the process of unification, he emphasized on military development and completed the unification through the three wars with Denmark, Austria and France respectively.
- 5. Both aimed at overturning the Austrian influence, for Cavour in north Italy and Bismarck in German Confederation. In other words, both set before them the task of destroying the Vienna Settlement.**
- i. For Cavour, it was the aggrandizement of Piedmont to include North Italy and the central duchies, for there lay the future of Piedmont's growing economy. In the Congress of Vienna, however, they were put under either direct or indirect control of Austria. Piedmontization or unification hence meant expulsion of Austrian influence. In the unification war, hence, defeat of Austria meant annexation of Italian lands.
  - ii. For Bismarck, he thought only of the security of the autocratic rule in Prussia and yet, unless it was extended throughout Germany, it would not be safe even in Prussia, for this reason he was to drive Austria out of Germany and tramp over the liberal rights of the German states as he did in 1865 to Schleswig-Holstein, in 1867 to the north German state and in 1871 to the south German states.
- 6. Both made their respective government lead the cause of national unity, merely to avert an internal revolution.**
- i. Cavour put himself first, he wanted to unify the Italian states under Piedmont leadership. He annexed Lombardy and the central duchies to prevent Mazzinian republicanism from spreading to the north, and invaded the south of Italy to stop Garibaldi from capturing Rome and thus stirring up a republican revolution throughout Italy.
  - ii. Similarly, Bismarck embarked on Prussian expansion in the hope of saving the Hohenzollern's autocratic rule and his ministry from a liberal revolution. As the question of military expenditure issue had developed into a political crisis, Bismarck had to collect the increased taxes without consent of the parliament in 1862, an act which was unconstitutional. The continual stubborn liberal opposition in the Prussian Diet threatened upon the policy of making the Germans forget liberty by giving satisfaction to the popular demands for national unity and coupling it with intoxication of military glories. Hence the war with Denmark and with Austria broke out. In truth, if Bismarck shrank from the cause of German unity, the German liberals would achieve it through a revolution.
- 7. Both Cavour and Bismarck aimed at a partial instead of complete unification.** Each turned the nationalist favor at unification of their own advantage.
- i. Cavour said in 1856 'the talk of Italian unity was a lot of nonsense'. Yet he reaped the fruits of Mazzini, Garibaldi and other Italian patriots' unwavering efforts. In the Plombieres Alliance, he even on the one hand aimed at unifying the north Italy only and on the other he ceded Nice and Savoy to France.
  - ii. In 1864-5 Bismarck refused to permit the union of Schlesig-Holstein, with the German Bound, for it would increase Austrian influence in the Diet. In 1866-67, he deliberately kept out the South German states from the Confed-

eration, for he feared that liberalism and Catholicism of the South German States would weaken Prussian leadership in the north. He never for a moment agreed to the plan for Great Germany to include Austria and all other Germans under one single flag, and in 1871 he even acted contrary to the principle of nationality and of the purity of the German empire by annexing Alsace-Lorraine.

**8. Both were anti-clerical.**

- i. Cavour's ministry affected dissolution of monasteries and the separation of the Church from the State. He even reinforced the Piedmont Constitution by eliminating some privileges of clergymen.
- ii. Bismarck's kulturkampf (it referred to the struggle between the government and the church over issues such as school management and appointment of church personnel) was directed against the Catholic influence in Germany. Both were realist, determinedly set against the ultimate hold of the Church over the political loyalty of individual subjects.

## Differences

**1. Bismarck was the leader and Cavour was the main architect.**

- i. 'Leader' means that the whole unification program was led by one person, accordingly the whole plan and what methods should be done at different stages was decided by him. It is clearly that in no other persons as important as Bismarck in the unification. He planned the wars with Denmark, Austria and finally France. To prevent French revenge he even designed the alliance system.
  - ii. 'Architect' implied that the success of unification was not only the contribution of one single individual. Indeed, many significant persons also played important roles in unification. King Emmanuel II, Mazzini and Garibaldi were good examples. Mazzini helped inspire the nationalistic idea in Italy, Garibaldi's conquest of the Two Sicilies completed the unification of South Italy. After the death of Cavour in 1861, unification with Venetia and Rome was completed by Emmanuel II. Thus, we can see that Cavour was not the only participant in the unification. He reaped the fruits of Mazzini and Garibaldi. Nonetheless, his skillful diplomacy and right methods of unification were really very important to the success of Italian unification.
2. To A.J.P. Taylor, both of them were opportunists who always engrossed with the present. They were also supreme practitioners of realpolitik and their success is to be explained more by the profound and imaginative grasp of the immediate realities of international politics than by any alleged control over the long-term course of events. As he said, "they were masterly statesmen and not masterful supermen." Nonetheless, in response to the international situation, **Bismarck was relatively active but Cavour was passive.**
- i. From the German unification, we can see that Bismarck had designed a careful plan and he actively exploited some favorable situation for unification. By inviting Austria at war with Denmark and by co-administration over Schleswig-Holstein, Bismarck trapped Austria into another war, after which the Northern German Confederation was established. Then by leaving the 4 Southern German states independent, Bismarck exploited the ambition of Napoleon III, and trapped France into war. Finally Germany was unified in the same sequence that Bismarck had expected. It is true that some international

changes such as the emergence of Italian kingdom in 1861 was unexpected, Bismarck had tried his very best to actively make use of the circumstances.

- ii. In the process of Italian unification Cavour never actively created any favorable international situation for unification. He by and large just passively waited for chances. Even he deliberately joined the Crimean War, it just shows that he was skillful and clever to use the chance to get friendship from other powers, he had not carefully designed a plan. He did not have any co-ordination with the revolutionaries in South Italy, and just reaped the fruits of Garibaldi. By exploiting Garibaldi's patriotism, he got the Two Sicilies and completed the unification of South Italy.

**3. In the methods of unification, they were different.**

- i. Without strong military base, Cavour knew that the only way led to the success of Italian unification was dependence on foreign aid. By joining the Crimean War, he got friendship from Britain and actual help from France, then Piedmont could gain Lombardy in the war with Austria. However, the withdrawal of France made the process stop for a while. This could prove that Italian unification really depended on foreign attitude and aid. Cavour's pursuit of this pragmatic approach really contributed to the success of unification a lot.
- ii. In German unification, however, Bismarck's Blood and Iron policy even dominated the success of German unification. 'Blood and Iron' policy was to isolate the enemies and then wage wars with them. Without Bismarck's isolationist policy and the three wars, the German Unification might not succeed. If Austria and France were not defeated by war, the North and South German States would not turn to Prussian side and the unification could not be completed.

**4. In the aspects of economic contribution, the role of Cavour was much crucial than that of Bismarck.**

- i. Cavour's greatest achievement was in the modernization of Piedmont. He gave a powerful lead to the developments of industry and trade in his state, and linked it to the western system of free trade. Compared with Bismarck, he paid more attention on economic rather than military power. The economic power he created in Piedmont paved the way for the conquest of the rest of Italy.
- ii. Bismarck, a Junker and losing in managing his own estates, **had taken little interest in industrial and commercial progress**, but by the time he rose to power, economic unification of Germany which reflected in the German Customs Union had already been accomplished and destined Germany for political unity. Bismarck owed much for his successes to that material force, although economy had been developed rapidly under his influence.

**5. Cavour and Bismarck had each built an empire, but the former was less successful.**

- i. Italy in 1861 and the following years did not achieve the degree of internal cohesion as Germany did. Despite the fact that Italy had an united kingdom and parliament at Turin in 1861, Cavour did practically nothing to weld the divergent social and political forces into unity. His anti-clericalism and persecution of democratic republicans rather aggravated the internal dissension, and thus, Italy was left torn by civil war and was weakened by the corruption of the Piedmontese bureaucracy and the political instability.
- ii. Neither did Bismarck make any serious concession to democracy. However his insistence on the absolute power of the monarchy consolidated the social

- and political forces to work within the German Empire and hence ensured internal unity.
- iii. Unification of the southern Italy was the work of Garibaldi rather than Cavour. Cavour died in 1861, when the Italian Empire was founded but Venetia and Rome were still excluded. Complete unification was realized when Austria and France were defeated by Prussia, but not by Cavour.
  - iv. To Bismarck, however, he not only envisaged several wars to eliminate the threat of foreign enemies as to complete unification in 1871, but also designed an alliance system to ensure security of the Empire.
6. In the first look, **Bismarck seemed to be more fortunate than Cavour** in that he enjoyed greater independence of action which the military power of Prussia ensured him. Nonetheless Bismarck had to face far more formidable enemies than Cavour, and each time he had to make sure that his enemy fought alone. Paradoxically, both showed a distrust of the domineering militarists who posed a challenge to their political guidance.

Examine the aims and means of Bismarck's foreign policy between 1862 and 1871 and discuss the contribution of Bismarck to the unification of Germany by 1871.

Born in 1815, Bismarck belonged to the Junker class. He had served in various diplomatic posts before he was appointed Minister-President of Prussia in 1861. He occupied this post for many years to come, doing great things for Prussia and completing German unification by 1871. He was excellent in diplomatic matters. More importantly he led the Germans accord to the correct ways in searching for the road to unification. In the following essay I would like to discuss the aims and means of his foreign policy between 1862 and 71, and how did he contribute to the unification by 1871.

Bismarck's primary concern was the national interests of Prussia. He believed that Prussian interests demanded first, her domination of whole of northern Germany, second, her leadership in the making of a new, united German Empire, and third, the expulsion of Austria from German affairs. In other words, the pursuit of these Prussian interests would at the same time lead to German unification, though on Prussian terms.

These aims necessarily brought Prussia into conflict with two major European powers: Austria and France. Bismarck realized that he had to defeat Austria in order to expel her from the German Confederation. Bismarck also understood that a showdown with France was inevitable because France would not allow the creation of a strong Germany in central Europe without a struggle.

Bismarck was a clever opportunist who took full advantage of events as they occurred to secure his aims. He played this role well because he had a realistic insight into the nature of European politics. Since he had served as Prussian delegate to the Diet of the German Confederation, and ambassadors to St. Petersburg and Paris, he acquired first-hand insight on the structure of the Confederation, the necessity of a Russo-Prussian understanding, and the weaknesses of Napoleon III of France.

Secondly, Bismarck displayed great diplomatic skill in his handling of foreign affairs. Whenever he decided to go to war with his enemy, he tried his best to isolate her and to secure allies on Prussian side. That would reduce danger of fighting a combination and suffering defeat.

Thirdly, having isolated his opponent diplomatically, Bismarck would rely on the use of force to achieve his aims. In view of the nature of obstacles, force was the only possibility. It could never be anticipated that Austria would be persuaded to give up her role of leadership or consent to a united Germany under Prussia. Compromise, discussion, agreement on the subject was impossible. Like wise, France would not want a strong and unified Germany on her border or allow the aggrandizement of Prussia. Thus she could never be persuaded to accept peacefully. The only way to overcome those was therefore force. 'Might is right' was so often said, Bismarck's close association with Roon and Moltke caused him to look to war and militarism.

As a result of the clear aims and correct methods, the Danish War, Austrian War as well as the French War were fought. With the gains of the three wars and Bismarck's diplomacy, a united Germany gradually came into being. In January 1871, in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, the German Empire was proclaimed. The Prussian King, William

I, became the German Kaiser while Bismarck was appointed Imperial Chancellor. Bismarck, in the process of unification, had made important contributions.

Firstly, he made Prussia the leader in the unification movement. This was a remarkable achievement when we recall that in 1850 Prussia was so humiliated by the Treaty of Olumtz. By 1867, when the North German Confederation was created, Austria was already completely excluded from German affairs. He realized the dream of Little Germany.

Secondly, he directed his diplomatic skillfully to achieve German unification. Since the German unity would affect the political scene of the European continent, Bismarck had to deal with the other great powers apart from Austria. He took advantage of events that occurred to achieve his goals. He also isolated his opponents before he took military actions. In his wars with Denmark, Austria and France between 1864 and 1870, these countries practically had to fight their own battle without allies. Neither Britain nor Russia played active roles in these wars or neither side because of the diplomatic maneuvers of Bismarck.

Thirdly, he took military actions to bring about unification. Under his influence, military reforms were carried out. Annual army intake was increased, while intensive military training raised the general standard of efficiency. Military budget was also increased, while strategic railways were built and new weapons and needle guns were invented and manufactured. The Prussian army was to be developed until it was strong enough to defeat Austria. In fact, Prussian military power was to be the chief factor in unifying Germany, for the Hapsburg Emperor would not voluntarily surrender the German supremacy. With the reformed army, however, Prussia should be able to beat Austria. Thus, Bismarck aimed to challenge Austria first for the leadership of the German states. He fought three wars to achieve Germany unity. Quite different from Cavour of Italy, Bismarck needed not rely on foreign military assistance.

Finally, he created a German Empire which was dominated by Prussia. For instance, the Prussian king was the hereditary German Kaiser, controlling civil administration through the Chancellor and the army through a military cabinet. Besides, Prussia had 17 out of 58 votes in the Federal Council and she could therefore block any unwelcome constitutional amendments.

In conclusion, Bismarck played an important role in unification. As A.J.P Taylor commented, "Bismarck's greatness lay not in mastering events, but in going with events so as to seem to master them". Getting a correct methods and clear aims, he successfully led the German to unification. In a comparison with the great heroes at the time such as Cavour and Garibaldi, his greatness was also inescapable. He was actually the brain and sword of German unification.



Explain the initial success and ultimate failure of the revolts which broke out in 1848 German Confederation.

V.D. Majahan, “The 1848 Revolutions were product of liberalism and nationalism..... In Central Europe such as German Confederation, it was a drive for both liberal and national targets.”

#### Reasons of initial success:

1. Busy of Austria in suppressing internal chaos: (please refer to the previous chapters highlighting on the difficulties of the Austrians in suppression of revolutions in various places such as Bohemia, Croatia, Hungary, Italian states as well as even Vienna.)
2. The flight of Metternich and the success of French Revolution encouraged the revolutionaries and discouraged the Austrians. Metternich signified the suppression and reactions, his downfall gave endless hope for revolutionaries to fight for their future even courageous than before. On the other hand, as France meant the home of revolutions, the success there also aroused the national and liberal sentiment in German Confederation.
3. The quasi-liberal character of William IV resulted in the promise of summoning the constituent Assembly.

#### Reasons of final failure

1. The rejection of Frederick William IV which disappointed many revolutionaries; the King of Prussia was not liberal enough and most important of all he submitted to the dictates of Metternich. As Bismarck recalled, “Prussian policy was made in Vienna.”
2. The internal split of the revolutionaries over the issue on ways of unification weakened the revolutionary forces, while the decision on Little Germany angered the Austrians.
3. Weakness of the revolutionaries:
  - i. The lack of military power of the Diet which made it powerless in facing the suppression; The Diet had no real power
  - ii. and the lack of connection with the mass which made it less powerful and less influential. Most German liberals and radicals were upper-middle-class intellectuals, few in number and quite out of touch with the German people which was still nearly three quarters rural. The revolution was played out on a carefully restricted stage. On the one side the ruling princes, on the other, the peasant masses cleared the stage; but the peasants were disciplined conscript in the Prussian armies. Taylor: “this divorce between the revolutionaries and the people determined the happening of 1848.”
4. The failure of revolutions in Austrian Empire and the assistance from Russia. (why Russia helped Austria in this case? You *yourselves* find out the answer! )

Compare and contrast the movements for national unification in Italy and Germany in the years 1815-1871, and their results. Of what special importance was political leadership in each case? How did *Realpolitik* apply in each instance?

The unification movements to create a united Italian kingdom and a united German empire “occurred simultaneously” in 1871 and occasionally shared such similar grounds for the unification as the legend of 1815 Settlement and Napoleon, the impacts of 1848 Revolutions, a strong leading state as well. Undeniably, it is also found some differences in their economic strength and the degree of reliance on foreign help. No matter how similar and different they were, it is evident that both political leadership and *realpolitik* played significant role in the cause of unification.

Examining the unification work in Germany and Italy, it was clear that both had been greatly affected by the legend of 1815 Settlement and Napoleon. Firstly, Germany and Italy was mapped by the Vienna Settlement of 1815 which made them so scattered with many independent states and the inclusion of foreign elements such as the Austrian domination in German Confederation and the great influence of the kings of England, Denmark and Holland in the Italian states. Negatively it created a sense of particularism and provincialism in both states which was an obstacle for unification movements. Positively, however, as John Kohn suggested, the “new framework of 1815 Settlement inspired Germany and Italy a sense of resistance against foreign role and of achieving national unity”.

Beside the Vienna Settlement the French aggression also provoked the feeling of nationality. The Napoleonic regime ‘infused new life’ into Italy and Germany with democratic and nationalistic ideas not only by its rule but by its “constant inroads of the French armies.” It helps explain the existence of so many nationalistic activities in the German Confederation and the Italian states after 1815. For instance, there were students’ movements at Jena with an aim of attaining the “great goal of national unity” in Germany after 1815 and the nationalistic movements organized by such secret societies as Carbonari, Young Italy and National Society in Italy.

The 1848 Revolution was of utter importance to both Germany and Italy, for it gave them “a deep sense of disillusionment” about the idealistic enthusiasm of revolutionary days as well as an understanding of the necessity of changing their respective strategies leading unification. For Italy it was believed that Austrian position was very strong and “it was not impossible oust her without foreign help”. Foreign help was then highly valued for the cause of unification. For Germany the political leaders found that the great question of the day would not be decided by speeches and the resolutions of majorities but, as David Thomson stated, by “blood and iron”.

Another similar feature was that both Italy and Germany were headed by a strong leading state--Piedmont and Prussia. As a result of Cavour’s progressive economic reforms and continued insistence that Piedmont should remain a constitutional monarchy, Piedmont won people’s confidence in her leadership. In Prussia the advanced economic progress starting from the establishment of Zollverein in 1820 associated with the civil and military reorganization by Bismarck, Prussia had been the strongest state economically, militarily and politically among the German states. It was Piedmont and Prussia assuming the political leadership to head the cause of unification

by rallying the scattered forces to the goal of unity and devoting their energies and efforts in the consolidation of domestic strength in face of external obstacles.

Apart from these similarities, it was known that both Piedmont and Prussia did not have any concrete and deliberate plan to unite the whole nation. Though Cavour and Bismarck contributed much to their respective unification movements, their main concern was but the interests of Piedmont and Prussia. Both movements “began with scheme for partial, not total, unification”. Cavour was a nationalist whose aims were enlarging Piedmont by unifying the northern part of Italy and driving out the Austrians. His promise to cede Nice and Savoy to France in the Franco-Piedmontese Alliance provided an evidence of such objective. Bismarck, as a nationalist, also put the Prussian interest in the top priority demanding the domination of the whole northern Germany and exclusion of Austria from German affairs.

For all similarities they shared, they were still different from each other with reference to their economic strength and the degree of reliance on foreign help.

On the subject of economic strength, Prussia had been rise to “hegemony over Germany” as a result of the development of Zollverein since 1820s. This not only increased the economic strength of Prussia but her influence over the other German State as well because the web of connection with and between regions was widened and thickened by the increasing co-operation. The reputation of Prussian government was raised in such a way that her economic sovereignty served as a strong base for her political and military sovereignty. For Italy, although Cavour’s policy of free trade and public finance encouraged the growth of Piedmontese economy, her economic development was slow compared with other western Europe countries. With different economic strength which was the basis of backing military force, it is no wonder that Piedmont’s army was weak and accustomed to defeats while Prussia’s army was renowned for its military spirit. Accordingly, Cavour had been convinced that “without foreign help, Piedmont’s armed forces would stand no chance” in any war. While Prussia did not heavily depend on foreign help in the war affairs because of her strong military force.

For the result of these two movements both accomplished the unification work by the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy and the German Empire in 1871. Yet, the founding of these two nations differed from each other in nature: Italy became a liberal and constitutional monarchy, while Germany was a rather dictatorial empire as the victories in wars “confirmed most Germans the superiority of their conservative monopoly over western democracy.”

The change of nation center, however, was another different result of the unification movements. As Piedmont formed only about one-tenth of united Italy, the national center of a united Italy shifted from Turin to Rome after the unification. So “Piedmont was absorbed in Italy”. For Prussia which formed about two-thirds of the united Germany the center of the nation remained in Berlin after unification. It was “Prussia which absorb the rest of Germany”.

The unity of Germany and Italy also produced a similar result: the triumph of nationalism at the expense of liberalism. “Many liberals in both countries accepted and even welcomed the gifts of national independence from the hands of kings.” So liberalism suffered a lasting loss from the events of 1871.

The significance of the rise of the two new nations was, however, by no means confined to their own nations. Following the accomplishment of the unification movements, their success resulted in “the political reshaping of central Europe north

and south of the Alps". The emergence of these powers altered the whole balance of power in Europe. The German unification was even a turning point in French history, for the loss of Alsace-Lorraine signified the end of French hegemony in Continental Europe and sowed the seeds of Franco-German hostility. The subsequent alliance system which created by Bismarck to avoid France revenge, overseas expansion of Italy and Germany to fulfill the national glory were all the by-products of the two movements and it well illustrated how they turned a new page in the European history.

In these unification movements political leadership played momentous role of taking the lead rallying the support and forces of scattered states and of consolidating the nations' power preparing the way for later wars' engagement.

In Germany, without Prussia's assumption of leadership and Bismarck's devotion on such internal programs as re-organization of armies, and on the unification programs, a united Germany was hardly to be achieved. As a leader of German unification, Bismarck had left no stones unturned to "re-organize, re-equip and enlarge the army" no matter how great opposition arose from the parliament which refused to vote the proposals for tax raises. He realized the need of strengthening military force for laying down a strong foundation for future war affairs in the cause of unification. Recognizing the usefulness of "Blood and Iron" strategy, he deliberately planned the wars with Denmark, Austria and France which not only proved the military strength of Prussia but facilitating the process of unification. His skillful manipulation of internal consolidation work and his seizure of initiative in provoking external war affairs all showed his invaluable contribution. Thus the importance of political leadership taken by Bismarck was revealed and obvious.

The importance of political leadership in Germany could also be witnessed by the willingness of liberals and middle class to follow the political cause by giving their support to the political leaders. Many Germans especially liberals believed that unity could not be won by economic forces only, and that's why the middle class and liberals came to think that it was their duty to throw in their lot with the military might of the state and inclined to leave their nation's fortune in the hands of professional politicians.

In the case of Italy, Piedmont alike Prussia also played a significant role of gathering the scattered forces from the Italian states and of strengthening nation's power by a series of intensive economic programs in 1850s. In this respect, Cavour's contribution should not be overlooked. His work on the promotion of economic development, the alliance with France against Austria in 1859 and the action to take Papal state checking Garibaldi's threat to Rome "succeeded in winning most of the rest of Italy for the Piedmont monarchy." His work was also extended with the inspiration of the nationality of other states like Parma, Modena, Tuscany which were willing to join Piedmont monarchy after the war against Austria in 1859. So Cavour's contributions showed clearly the significance of political leadership.

Nonetheless, one should also notice that the role of political leadership in the Italian unification was not as active as that in German unification. As aforementioned Cavour's main concern was to build up a northern kingdom of Italy under the Piedmont leadership. He didn't cherish to unite the southern parts of Italian states. It was later Garibaldi's military expedition of Sicily and Naples engineering Cavour to take the action occupying Papal States for fearing that Rome might be threatened by Garibaldi's action. And it was Garibaldi who annexed the Naples and Sicily and handed these states to Victor Emmanuel II. This showed the weakness of Piedmont assuming the political leadership in the unification cause for Piedmont's armies was not as powerful as that of

Garibaldi to invade these two states. In this way here produces a clear picture that the union with Naples, Sicily was accidental which was mainly contributed by national patriot, such as Garibaldi, instead of political leadership.

Besides, throughout the cause for Italian unification, the heavy reliance on favorable international circumstances and foreign assistance again revealed the passiveness of political leadership. Restricted by the subjective conditions that the Piedmont's army was too weak to fight a war, Italy had to rely on foreign help and wait for favorable circumstances in the three wars of 1859, 1866 and 1870. For instance, when Franco-Prussian War started in 1870 Italy waited for the retreat of French troops in Rome so that she could enter and occupy Rome without the resistance of the French armies. This was the revelation of the significance of foreign help and favorable milieu in the Italian movement, and in this case the political leadership seemed to be important in searching foreign support and grasping every chance given by favorable condition but not in taking the initiative to complete the work of unification in Italy comparatively.

For both movements it was shown that *realpolitik* did apply in each case. *Realpolitik* can be defined as a pragmatic and realistic means to achieve the ultimate goals. As John Kohn puts, it is a "step forward in the realization of national goals in Central Europe, no longer by popular revolutions and moralist propaganda but by governments, war and diplomacy." Both adopted *realpolitik* after the 1848 Revolutions.

With regards to the strategies applied in the German unification, Bismarck did use the *realpolitik* to achieve his goals. Firstly, his adoption of the 'blood and iron' policy rather than the policy of parliamentary discussion showed the application of *realpolitik*. Adopting war or force as a means to achieve the goal was no longer idealistic but more pragmatic to fulfill the objectives. Furthermore, his insistence on reorganization and re-equipment of army did show his realization of the importance of military strength in achieving unification. Thus Prussia no longer depended on parliament discussion but force to achieve unification and this indicated the declining importance of idealism in that contemporary Europe.

His skillful manipulation of the dispute between Germany and other countries for giving the pretext of war was surely another kind of *realpolitik*. For instance, attempting to test the military strength of "newly-organized" armies and create the possibility of trouble with Austria, Bismarck made the best use of Schleswig-Holstein succession question to make an alliance with Austria. This was an important step starting the unification movement for the statesman had prepared way to wipe Austria out of the German states by stirring conflicts about these two duchies with Austria.

Before engaging in each war, he would also keep the other major powers out of the action by his skillful diplomacy. This was best shown in the Franco-Prussian War in which Bismarck successfully isolated France by diplomatic means. For example, Italy and Russia promised their neutrality in case of war against France for Italy was betrayed by France in 1859 and Russia was defeated by France in the Crimean War. For Austria, as she was treated in a lenient way after the defeat in Austro-Prussian War in 1866 she also gave the similar promise. All these revealed that Bismarck's skillful work of preparing wars for unification. As David Thomson described, he had "timed his action with great insight and skill" and the German success in the three wars during the course of unification proved the wistful application of *realpolitik*.

In case of Italian unification, the application of *realpolitik* can also be revealed by several ways. In the first place, the reliance on foreign help in the course of unifi-

cation was a kind of *realpolitik*. The realization of Piedmont's military weakness in fighting war with great powers engineered Piedmont finding foreign help. Therefore Cavour's effort in securing the French promise to support Piedmont in a war against Austria while annexing Savoy and Nice as a price to France for her help was a practical means to facilitate the unification. The results of Austro-Piedmont war with annexation of Lombardy to Piedmont proved that such strategy could work.

Again Cavour's contribution on the internal consolidation by promoting several economic programs for economic development after 1848 Revolution was also practical and realistic. Concentrating efforts on internal development not only laid down a good foundation for later war affairs but also raised the position of Piedmont to be the political leadership among the Italian states because of the increased power. So the movement was pragmatic in devoting the energy on internal consolidation and then external war affairs rather than on revolutions.

Since Cavour believed that advantage had to be taken of "whatever opportunities arise by chance and unforeseen", his successors who took immediate action to capture Rome when France withdrew his troops from Rome for war against Prussia proved the acceptance and great probability of his idea of *realpolitik*.

In short, these two movements was a landmark in the European history for it not only opened a leaf of live to the Italians and German but the all the people of Europe in the 19th century. This was because the remarkable results of the movements exposed the feasibility of *realpolitik* and the incapability of idealism in ruling the nations. As Mahajan correctly puts, both Bismarck and Cavour were "supreme practitioners of *realpolitik*", their success was to be explained more by the profound and imaginative understanding of immediate realities of international politics than by any alleged control over the long-term course of events. Such success gave an impetus to the European powers changing their strategies by adopting more pragmatic means to achieve the national goals. Since then the Powers expanded their national interests no longer by congresses but by military force. Therefore the emergence of extreme nationalism, militarism, and colonial expansion in the later half of 19th century and even the early 20th century were all by-products of these unification movements.

“Nationalism and liberalism went hand in hand.” Discuss the validity of this statement with reference to the German unification movement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. (draft)

In different stages the focus of the German unification varied. Nationalism and liberalism were the main shaping forces in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, to a large extent, the statement is valid because it is found that in many times, nationalism and liberalism were stressed in the unification simultaneously.

Don't confuse yourself first. Tell me what is the meaning of “went hand in hand”- roughly, it should be understood as both sides play an important role and crucial **at the same time** in the unification movement. That means a strong desire for liberal measures and national achievement always appeared at the same time.

Then the draft could be done as follows: (I will just give you a briefing about the role of nationalism and liberalism in different stages, the rest is on yourself.)

- 1 1830 revolutions: liberalism rather than nationalism was stressed. The Young Germany which stressed on national unity was not popular in the meantime. Instead, most radicals regarded nationalism as an anarchistic and retrograde force. Liberal measures or reforms were the main concern of the Germans. For example, influenced by the July Revolution of France, agitation and revolution broke out in some parts of Germany. The rulers of Saxony, Brunswick and Hesse-Cassel were forced to abdicate and constitutions were introduced. Later, a constitution was also granted to Hanover. Despite its failure, the struggle for liberalism was reflected clearly both in its aims and the changes after the revolution.
- 2 1848 revolutions: both nationalism and liberalism went hand in hand. The setting up of the German Customs Union which meant economic unification aroused national feeling among the Germans. National liberalism was the dominant political posture of the 1840s, demanding for liberal constitution and for unification. This could be reflected in both the desire and changes made by the revolutionaries in 1848 revolution. Indeed, as early as in 1847 the Prussian king allowed 8 provincial states to meet as a united estate. Though the liberals failed to attain their objectives, the sharp conflicts between the crown and the estate helped weaken the basis of Prussian absolutism. During the Civil War in Swiss in the late 1847, German liberals even demanded the immediate summoning of a German national parliament. Unrest of 2 German states brought unbelievable harm to the prestige of monarchy in South Germany.

Similar to the 1830 revolution, shortly after the 1848 Revolution in France, the Germans excited and were inspired. From 15<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> March there were riots in Berlin. Frederick William IV was forced to declare his willingness to ‘merge Prussia into Germany’ and agreed to summon a Constituent Assembly. Freedom of speech and press, and one nation citizenship were promised. Smaller German states also made concessions to the revolutions. Towards the end of March, about 5,000 leaders determined to establish democracy and equality in Germany. They met at Frankfurt and formed themselves a provisional government and called for a national assembly. They were going to draw up constitution for a united Germany. The issue of methods of unification was discussed such as the Greater Germany and Lesser Germany. This national assembly was generally known as the Frankfurt Parliament. It was mainly a middle class body which particularly concerned with the preparation of the federation of the German lands. In March 1849, a constitu-

tion was adopted and King Frederick William IV was elected as the Emperor. Despite the ultimate failure, nationalism and liberalism were both the targets of revolutionaries. Clearly as it shown, nationalism and liberalism went hand in hand in this critical period.

- 3 post 1848 (1848-1870). Nationalism was the main focus of the national movement. For example, Bismarck used the Blood and Iron policy to complete unification or Lesser Germany through the wars. In the meantime, nationalism was the slogan to get popular support. Prince Christian of Glucksburg's ambition to annex Schleswig immediately met with nationalistic outcry from the Bundestage of Frankfurt on behalf of Germany. Why, they asked, should the German minority in southern Schleswig be annexed to a foreign power, and permanently lost to the German fatherland? The Bundestage decided to go to war and this golden chance was made use by the Iron Chancellor. In the Denmark War, nationalism was used to provoke war with Denmark and ally with Austria in order to test the latter strength. After the war, Bismarck also cleverly used the Schleswig-Holstein Question to trap the Austrians. When the Germans in Holstein was badly treated by the Austrians, nationalism was again used by Bismarck to exert pressure on Austria. The Austro-Prussian War was later again under the slogan of nationalism.
- 4 After the Austro-Prussian War, Bismarck exposed the ambitions of Napoleon III in the Rhinelands to communicate to the four independent south German states. Nationalism was aroused and caused the latter to throw themselves into the arms of Prussia. Secret treaties were arranged in which Prussia guaranteed their territory and they promised to put their armies under Prussian control in case of war. Bismarck also made use of the personal ambition of Napoleon III, especially the desire to get Luxemburg which had been a member of the old German Confederation, to rally the support of enraged German nationalists and intensify ill-will between the French and the Germans particularly those in the four independent South German states. National humiliation and revenge on France was emerged again in the Ems Telegram when German opinion rejoiced at the king's defiance of unwarranted claims.
- 5 Liberalism was discredited as according to Bismarck's famous words: "the major question today should not be speech and majority, but blood and iron." Nonetheless, to regard the disappearance of liberal demands from the political scene is one misunderstanding. In the road to unification and in the eyes of the Germans, liberalism still had its place. For example, in 1860, a new liberal party called the Progressive Party was founded. It aimed at the establishment of the Germany with a centralized power in the Prussian hand, but it still clung to the 1848 liberal principle of parliamentary control over administration. In the political crises which followed, the mounting liberal opposition in the Prussian parliament threatened the existence of Bismarck's ministry. It was to save the Hohenzollern's autocratic rule and his own power that Bismarck resolved on the policy of undermining liberalism by giving satisfaction to the popular demand for national unity and coupling it with intoxication of military glory. Hence, it brought the war with Denmark in 1864. Nonetheless, the Gastein settlement of 1865 did not quite appease the liberals, for in February 1866 a vote of censure on confidence in ministry was passed by the Prussian Diet indicating that autocratic rule might be overthrown. Once again, Bismarck sought to put down political unrest at home by waging a war with Austria. In this way, **it was the liberal opposition at home that compelled him to take up the cause of German unity.**



1. Nonetheless, one must not refute that the role of liberalism declined. For the sake of nationalism, liberalism was sometimes deliberately ignored out of the reality. For examples, when the lower house of the Parliament continued to refuse to vote the army budget, Bismarck solved this problem by ignoring the Parliament and illegally collecting taxes to finance the military program to increase and reorganize the Prussian army so that it was strong enough to win any war it undertook. There was a case for a larger military establishment, if Prussia was to live up to her status as a “great power” and to live down the diplomatic humiliations of recent years. Bismarck had no hesitation in violating the constitution, for he despised liberalism and parliamentary assemblies and believed in order, service and duty. For four years he continued to oppose the will of the lower house and the vast body of public opinion which supported it. As a result he became the most hated person in Prussia but the struggle for national unification was made possible. Clearly as it shown, liberalism sometimes did not go hand in hand with nationalism. In other words, nationalism went hand in hand with real politick instead of liberalism.
- 1 (In the last place, in discussing the role of nationalism, you must clearly understand that even Bismarck had betrayed nationalism in several ways. Nonetheless, should this be answered in this question? ) To a large extent, it is valid because nationalism always went hand in hand with liberalism. Option 1 (First, the 1830 rev. + 1848 rev + 48-70 development to show that they always went hand in hand. Then, used the 1830 rev. or 48-70 development to show that sometimes either liberalism or nationalism was ignored. ) Option 2 (First, clearly state that only 1848 rev and part of 1848-70 development showed the validity of the statement; then discuss how the two forces went hand in hand in these periods, finally, point out that 1830 rev-nationalism was not popular; while in 48-70 development liberalism was sometimes ignored facing the reality.) Both options are without great problem, the possibility of scoring high marks actually depends on your presentation skill- argumentative? informative? Good Luck.

In what ways did the German unification under the leadership of Prussia mark the end of the Concert of Europe?

Should the Concert of Europe mean the maintenance of peace among the Big Powers, one might argue that it had been ended as early as the outbreak of the Crimean War. Nonetheless, should one view deeper and understand that moral restraints including compensation, negotiation and the balance of power were the main features of the Concert of Europe which desired by Great Powers, the German unification certainly led to the final collapse of this old fashion. In this aspect, it may say, to a large extent, the German unification since 1848 under the Prussian leadership had marked the end of the Concert of Europe.

The 1848 Revolution told the Germans, especially Bismarck, that speech and majority could not solve the problems, instead, they believed “Mighty is right” and used force. From the Disraeli Report 1862, one could say that the German unification under Prussian leadership was partly a result of the strategy of Bismarck, who had a rough plan for transforming Germany into a unified empire since he assumed the Chancellorship of Prussia in that particular year. It was also partly due to his ability to keep up with the changing politics of Europe, and manipulate the situation to the advantage of Germany. It was clear that Bismarck used power politics, which meant that he used whatever means available to achieve his aim. He even resorted to cheating and secret alliances to implement the German unification. The moral restraints imposed by the Concert of Europe on aggressive statesmen were no longer effective in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. Indeed, the Prussian success in unifying Germany with cunning politics and wars proved to the world that militarism and power politics gained at the end of the day. What had been achieved by concerted action through negotiations between 1815-56 was then being achieved by military force and power. Europe entered into a new stage after 1871 when Prussia unified Germany that war.

Discuss the significance of the 1848 Revolutions in Germany and the Hapsburg Empire.

The 1848 Revolutions that took place in Germany, Italy, Austria-Hungary came to an end by August 1849, with the collapse of the Hungarian revolution and the fall of Rome and Venice. In other places such as France, Austria and Germany, revolutions had failed at the end of 1849 with the restoration of authoritarian rule. However, if it were seen in long-term perspective, the ultimate result of the revolution would have presented a different picture. A lesson from the speedy collapse of the revolutionary movements, plus the brutality displayed by the restored reactionary rule, helped the Empire eventually with unification of both Germany and Italy by the nationalists. The significance of the 1848 revolutions in Germany and the Hapsburg Empire will be given as follows.

The revolutions were essential nationalistic in nature, popular insurrections against foreign rule and against the dreary repressive policy of Metternich. Liberalism was also aimed at, as well as for social and economic changes. Nevertheless, although constitutional changes were enforced by the revolutionaries, liberalism and democracy were not so much emphasized as the need for national unity and independence. This was especially true for the Germans. After the failure of the insurrection, the Prussians under Prince Von Bismarck used means of expulsion of the Austrians and the attachment of national independence and unity rather than constitutional methods. Thus, the failure of the Frankfurt Assembly was important to pave the way for the rise of Prussia as the major military power in Europe, and took the lead in the unification of that nation and the elimination of Austrian control and influence. Had the Frankfurt Assembly achieved its purposes of giving life and substance to the national government, the history of Germany would have been built on the basis of enlightened democratic opinion and would have been a guarantee of peace instead. However the record of failure of the Assembly and the internal dissension between the middle classes were well-established in power due to the revolution, and the working class who challenged their monopoly of power, plus the fact that the Prussian king, Frederick William, not only refused the crown offered to him by the parliament, but also withheld his consent to the Frankfurt constitution, thus sealing the fate of the National Assembly.

“The revolutions in Germany between 1848 and 1850 were motivated by liberalism and nationalism”. Elaborate this statement.

V.D. Majahan have commented that “The 1848 Revolutions were product of liberalism and nationalism.” Indeed, 1848 has long been dubbed as the ‘Year of Revolutions’ in European history because in that year revolutions swept most European countries, except Britain and Russia. In German Confederation, revolts also broke out shortly after the February Revolution in France. These were motivated by the two major shaping forces in modern times- nationalism and liberalism, as the following discussion will disclose.

In Prussia, shortly after the February Revolution in France, unrest took place in Berlin in March 1848. To avoid civil war and to pacify the Liberals’ discontent, King Frederick William IV of Prussia agreed to form a liberal ministry and prepare a constitution. He also declared himself in favor of a federal German state to replace the German Confederation. Soon, he moved to Potsdam to bid his time for counter-revolution.

The elected Constituent Assembly, in the process of drafting a constitution, fell apart because of the split between the radical demands of the workers’ and peasants’ representatives and the moderate demands of the propertied classes. Such division facilitated the Prussian government to stage a successful counter-revolution.